

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

OCTOBER, 1886.

ARTICLE I.

INVOCATION OF THE SAINTS.*

By REV. J. C. KOLLER, D. D., Hanover, Pa.

The subject of Article XXI. of the Augsburg Confession gives a clear and succinct statement *De Cultu Sanctorum* or *Vom Heilgendienst*. As read before the Emperor the language is as follows:

"*De Cultu Sanctorum* docent, quod memoria Sanctorum proponi potest, ut imetemur fidem eorum et bona opera iuxta vocationem, ut Caesar imitari potest exemplum Davidis in bello gerendo ad depellendos Turcos a patria. Nam uterque rex est. Sed Scriptura non docet, invocari Sanctos, seu petere auxilium a sanctis, quia unum Christum nobis proponit mediatorem, propitiatorium, pontificem, intercessorem. Hic invocandus est, et promisit se exauditurum esse preces nostras, et hunc cultum maxime probat, videlicet ut invocetur in omnibus afflictionibus. 1 Joh. 2 : 1. *Si quis peccat habemus advocatum apud Deum, cet.*"—*Müller, Symbolischen Bücher*, p. 47.

"Concerning the invocation of saints our churches teach, that the saints may be held in remembrance, in order that we may, each in his own calling, imitate their faith and good works; as that the emperor may imitate the example of David, in carrying on war to expel the Turks from our country; for each of them is a king. But the Scripture does not teach us to invoke

*Holman Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., June 10th, 1886.

saints or to seek aid from them. For it proposes Christ to us as our only Mediator, Propitiation, High Priest and Intercessor. On him we are to call, and he promises that he will hear our prayers, and highly approves of this worship, viz.: that he should be called upon in every affliction. 1 John 2 : 1: "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."—*Gen. Synod's Book of Worship.*

The phraseology of the English translation fails to bring out some few shades of meaning, found in the German and Latin texts, which are of sufficient importance to be noticed in the body of the discussion. The contents of the Article do not formally include the veneration of relics and images, neither do they specifically mention "Virgin worship," both of which are in themselves vast subjects for research, and will therefore only be mentioned in illustrating the main thought to which the present treatment is limited by the Lutheran doctrine on the worship of saints.

WHO THE SAINTS ARE.

Although the Confession does not distinctly specify who the saints are, it is in place here to venture a brief definition, because the question in controversy has been made to turn on a correct understanding of the declaration in the Apostles' Creed: "*I believe in the communion of saints.*" The silence of the confessors has been misinterpreted. Even the saintly Claus Harms* italicised his opinion: *We have no saints.* But Carpzov† summarizes the beliefs of the early Protestants as follows: "The saints are those who once believed in God, were faithful to him, trustingly fulfilled their calling in life and are now living in heaven." This appellation is founded on the word of God and establishes that the saints are, *first*, all true Christians,‡ baptized in the name of the Triune God;§ separated from the ungodly;|| consecrated to Christ¶ and justified by His righteousness.** To this objective characteristic there belongs, *secondly*, a sub-

*Die Augburgische Confession, 216.

†Isagoge in Libros Symbolicos, 537.

‡Rom. 1 : 7.

§2 Peter 2 : 9.

||2 Cor. 6 : 17.

¶1 Cor. 1 : 2.

**1 Cor. 6 : 11.

jective qualification, namely, inner striving after holiness;* unblemished earthly citizenship;† a steady advancement in the cardinal graces of a spiritual life‡ and a perceptible increase of power over temptation,§ not implying, however, sinless perfection||. And the *third* peculiarity to be marked is the distinction between the saints on earth and the saints in heaven. They are the saints in the church militant who are found in all places where the Gospel has been accepted¶ and those of the church triumphant who have a share in the resurrection of Christ,** shall participate†† in his second coming and with‡‡ him judge the world.

Only those are denominated saints in heaven who had been truly such upon the earth; so that to the times of Irenaeus and Tertullian all who were united to Christ are known as the *hagioi*. And the confessional writings lay strong emphasis upon this fact, showing how faithfully the Holy Scriptures portray not only the virtues but also the mistakes of the saints in order to enforce the need of prudence in imitating their examples. Luther at one time forcibly insisted that the little word "*holy*" was applied by the sacred writers only to the living believer in the name of Christ and that God permitted scarcely any great saint to live faultlessly—as Moses, Aaron, Miriam, David—lest dependence should be placed in their examples and works to the neglect of God's word. §§

Doubtless the Confessors were justified in their moderate and carefully guarded opinion, for the Roman Catholic theory on what constitutes saintliness differs materially from the Protestant. Its defenders call those who belong to the visible communion "the faithful," and those of the invisible communion are "the saints."

Bellarmin is authority for the generally adopted definition: ||| "The saints are the spirits of pious men (*hominum*) who are

*Acts 15 : 9. †1 Pet. 1 : 15. ‡2 Pet. 1 : 5-8. §2 Cor. 7 : 1.

||Compare Pusey : Rule of Faith, 165.

¶Ps. 16 : 2, 3; Acts 9 : 32; 2 Cor. 1 : 2.

**Matt. 27 : 52.

††2 Thess. 1 : 10.

‡‡1 Cor. 6 : 2.

§§Plitt : Einleitung in die Augustana II., 436.

|||De Beatitudine Sanctorum.

released from the body and need no purgation, but are already admitted into the fruition of blessedness which consists in the clear vision of God." An analysis of this tenet, in the light of the writings and practices of its advocates, brings into prominence these points: The saints are the men and women who have professedly led Christian lives and perfectly fulfilled the will of God; who have gained superior sanctity by works of supererogation; who, after death, have power to work miracles through the instrumentality of their bones or in answer to the supplications of the distressed and *finally* who have been canonized or authoritatively placed in the ranks of saintship.* It is not maintained that the Bible sustains or justifies this theory. The Council of Trent, in formulating and defining the subject of invocation, did not pretend to cite any testimony from Christ or his apostles to designate those who are to be invoked. The most important factor is Canonization. The reverence shown to the uncanonized is far inferior to that offered to the canonized. At first it was the people—say the Christian people—who created the saints, just as it is the people now who, in their mysteriously unconscious power bestow upon some favorite ruler the surname of the "Great" or the "Good." But nothing else could be expected than that in such an act of beatification the limits of human ingenuity would occasionally be reached, and some one would attain to saintly preference whom posterity has either forgotten or who perhaps has never lived at all. The beautiful legend of St. Christopher is nothing but an allegory and has no better foundation than the pious wish, ever since the days of Ignatius, that every Christian should be a Christopherus—a *Christ-bearer*. Thus also the legend of St. George and the dragon is a noble symbol of the victory of Christianity over heathenism. These are inspiring examples; but the *Flos Sanctorum* and the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists both teem with far more sensational and legendary literature. Yet they pretend to contain only reliable history.† Carpzov pronounces the *Vitae Sanctorum* "fabulous."

Stimulated by this underground tendency to beatify and by the

*Comp. Berger: *Ev. Glaube, &c.*, 272.

†Miracles and Saints, 60.

literature growing out of it, the monks, from very early times, lived in the highest expectation of becoming saints; the common people impressed with their lives of devotion and piety silently accorded them superhuman honors; the bishops sympathizing with these manifestations of faithfulness, reported the cases to the Pope, and he, if satisfied with the life, manner of death and works, would add the sanction of his authority, and the worship would be no longer confined to a single community.*

When order and system became necessary in the classification of the faithful who had died, canonization became a prerogative of the Pope. The Roman Curia had pronounced in individual cases as early as the 10th century, but in the 12th the chief Pontiff began to exercise as his exclusive right what the reformatory councils of the 15th vigorously but fruitlessly attacked. In his jurisdiction lies the power to determine who are worthy of reverence and adoration. Hence, as Hase naively remarks he has, as in the case of delivery from purgatory, more power in heaven than on earth. No angelic or spiritual beings can prevent him from peopling the upper world with his own creatures, but the political influences and national prejudices of this world can hamper him with limitations, as for instance, when the opposition of the French and Spanish crowns forbade the canonizing of Bellarmin himself.† This is one of the unfortunate, but fatally consistent outgrowths of that doctrinal development which the great English Cardinal has so masterfully substituted "for the insufficiency of scriptural testimony." Such unwelcome interferences go far in discrediting expedients which have no firm support in the "*pillar and ground of the truth.*" But they who entrust themselves to the uncertainties of evolution must be prepared to encounter its vagaries and eccentricities. There is only One who has the right to canonize. "My Father has given them unto me."‡ "God shall exalt them."§ "I will give thee the crown of life."|| Hence Wickliffe is moved to say: "Canonization by the pope is blasphemous, because, with-

*Neander: Ecclesiastical History, 3: 447.

†Hase: Polemik, 301 *et seq.*, discusses canonization fully and admirably.

‡John 10: 29.

§James 4: 10.

||Rev. 2: 10.

out direct revelation, no human being can be certain of any one's future state." And Luther, who is generally more concerned about the execution of his words than their elegance, exclaims: "How often may a devil be esteemed a saint and we consider those saints who belong to hell."* He would not have changed his mind if he had lived a while longer, for is not St. Raymund worshiped as a confessor on the ground of having induced the King of Aragon to establish the inquisition in his kingdom? And was not Pope Pius V. canonized,† although his hands were stained with the blood of thousands of faithful disciples of Christ, and he bribed Rudolphi to assassinate Queen Elizabeth?‡ Even Pius IX. placed in the ranks of saintship Don Pedro Arbues after he had burned hundreds of converted Jews who had been found guilty of attachment to the religion of their fathers. What possible communion can there be between these saints of the Inquisition and the saints of the New Testament! It is not a difference in *time* but *spirit*. And so radical a difference between Protestant and Catholic, as to the characteristic qualities of the true saints, will go far in determining what honor will be accorded them.

THE HONOR ACCORDED THEM BY THE CONFESSORS.

Their language is unmistakable: "Concerning the invocation of the saints our churches teach that the saints may be held in remembrance in order that we may, each in his own calling, imitate their faith and good works." The German text is a little more specific and conveys a few additional ideas.§ The doctrinal statement, though pronounced in its antagonism against worshipping the saints, is not open to the charge of disrespect for them, though Romanists have persistently put that misinterpretation upon it. A fair interpretation of the phraseology will make clear several salient points, all of which are rooted and grounded in the word of Truth.

1. The saints should be held in remembrance because thereby the honor and glory of God will be promoted. The honor

*Luther's Works, Erlangen Ed., 8 : 37.

†Very few popes were canonized.

‡Jenkins, 199.

§Mueller: Symbolischen Bücher, 47.

ascribed to them is an *actio gratiarum**—an expression of gratitude to God who works in his saints the accomplishment of his will and supplies them with an abundant measure of faith and courage. "The righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance."† Melancthon‡ amplifies this sentiment in the Apology: "The honoring is done by thanking God for showing us examples of his grace in the lives of the saints and for supplying the church with teachers and other gifts. Now as these gifts are great we esteem them, and praise the saints who made good use of them, as Christ in the Gospel praised the faithful servants."§ Paul commends such a remembrance when he writes to the Galatians that those who praised him without ever having seen him face to face *glorified God in him*.|| According to some of the best expositors of the Confession this remembrance does not necessarily terminate in pronouncing eulogies upon their remarkable virtues and achievements, but permits the use of pictures and images as an effectual means of recalling the history of their lives and sufferings; and it approves also of festival days to commemorate the anniversary of some notable event in their career. Luther says: "If invoking them is abandoned, pictures may be used to represent them to our eyes, just as letters are used to convey ideas to the mind."¶

2. In preserving the remembrance of the saints we obtain confirmation of our own faith. In honoring them as monuments of God's infinite love and mercy there is quickening and encouragement to our spiritual life, because they are the practical examples of human possibilities under the power of divine grace. The Apology says:** By their example we strengthen our faith. Thus, for instance, when we see that through the rich grace of God Peter's sin was forgiven after his denial of Christ, our hearts receive strength to believe that grace abounds much more than sin.†† The Scriptures also extol and celebrate the gifts of God communicated to the saints and praise the saints

*Walch: De Augustana Confessione, 329.

†Ps. 116: 12.

‡Müller, 223.

§Matt. 25: 21-23.

||Gal. 1: 24.

¶The authority is not that of the Symbols but of Luther: Guericke, Symbolik, 238.

**Mueller: Apologia, 223.

††Rom. 5: 20.

themselves for having made good use of them. The commendation of the Baptist by the Saviour;* the eulogy of Stephen upon the Old Testament worthies;† and that grand epic‡ in the epistle to the Hebrews are striking illustrations of the confessional teaching. But in according the saints this honor the Reformers were careful to emphasize the distinction between what they called the reverence of the knee and the reverence of the heart.§ They agree with Augustine in saying: "We honor the memories of the martyrs, in order that by that celebration we may both render thanks to God for their victories and encourage ourselves to the emulation of their crowns and palms."||

3. The saints should be held in remembrance by imitating the examples they left the world while living. "Remember them that had the rule over you, which spake unto you the word of God; and considering the issue of their life, imitate their faith."¶ The language of the Confession, amended by that of the Apology gives a clear conception of the teaching: "We honor them by following their faith, love and patience each one in his own calling." As an illustration there is cited the case of the Emperor studying, in his preparations for the conflict with the Turks, the example of David as a model of imperial wisdom and courage. The apostolic fathers—notably St. Clement—called attention to this idea. In his Epistle to the Corinthians he writes: "Let us steadfastly contemplate those who have perfectly ministered to his excellent glory—Enoch for his obedience, Noah for his faithfulness, Elijah for his humility."** To these can be added the piety of Mary the mother of Jesus, Hannah's attachment to the house of the Lord, the unwearied fidelity of St. Paul, Stephen's steadfastness in the faith, and the love of St. John for his fellow-man. Melancthon stoutly insisted that saintly intercession consisted in "the living saints praying for one another," and Hildebert of Tours, who represented the spiritual Christianity of the twelfth century, says: "The only genuinely Christian element lying at the foundation of true saint

*Matt. 11 : 4.

†Acts 7 : 5.

‡Heb. 11.

§Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, Pt. III., Cap. 3, Sec. 1.

||City of God, Chap. 8.

¶Heb. 13 : 7. Mueller, *Sym. Büch.*, 224.

**The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I., 7.

worship is: Love among them in life.* Remembering† the bonds of the saints, ministering‡ to their necessities, holding collections§ for their benefit, emulating one another in showing them preference of place,|| bearing their burdens¶—this is the Christlike and apostolic manner of doing them reverence; or in the words of Luther,** “the right spiritual exaltation and honor belonging to the saints.” Thus also pleads truthfully Cassander††—the amiable and enlightened Roman Catholic divine—in his *Consultatio* to harmonize the Augsburg Confession with the faith of the Romish Church: “these are the true relics of the saints, which must be imitated by the faithful, namely the examples of their godliness and virtues as found in their writings and their lives.” We are reminded here of the beautiful saying of Agobard of Lyons: “Better copy the works of the living saints than invoke the intercession of the dead saints.”

That a remembrance of the saints such as is authorized and encouraged by a correct understanding of the Confession, should be more faithfully advocated and observed, goes without saying. It will not involve Protestant Christendom in any superstitious practices. Why should we hesitate to pronounce eulogies over the righteous and noble souls whose faithfulness has added so much to the moral refitting of this globe? To be unappreciative of the saints on earth, to withhold from them recognition for their instrumentality in carrying forward God's purposes of salvation; to ignore them as exemplars of a godly life while present here, usually presages an excessive adulation and superstitious veneration for them after their death. How natural that is, too! Men of high religious aspirations, who have labored for the revival or reformation of religion—after having received ridicule and persecution on all sides except from a small body of homage-bearing disciples—have been apotheosized and worshiped as virtual deities after death. On the other hand a remembrance founded in the truths of God's teachings interpenetrates the heart with that spirit which humanizes all sensibility

*Neander, Ch. Hist.

†2 Tim. 1: 5.

‡2 Cor. 9: 1.

§1 Cor. 16: 1.

||Rom. 12: 10.

¶Gal. 6: 2.

**Works, Erlangen, 24: 249.

††Jenkins: Romanism of Pius IV. 215.

and fixes the instinct of adoration upon God. It has been the universal experience of the best men that the closer one's communion with Christ, the intenser will be the feeling toward all true believers—not to worship them after death but to associate with them in life—for the consciousness of true religion, the real, living consciousness is, for one thing, the power of God working in the soul a longing after communion with the saints. In such a feeling of veneration for them there is a most salutary fascination. How natural that the eye should follow into the upper world the noble souls who were our friends in adversity, or who had been instrumental in our advancements—the old pastors, the beloved teachers of our childhood and early youth, the revered preceptors of our maturer years! Even though we do not direct our petitions to them, “they sometimes seem to be flesh again; they breathe upon us with warm breath; they touch us with soft responsive hands; they look at us with sad sincere eyes, and speak to us in appealing tones; they seem to be reclothed in living human reality, with all its conflicts, its faith and its love. Then their presence is a power, then they shake us like a passion and we are drawn after them with gentle compulsion, as flame is drawn to flame.”* There is an instinctive out-reaching for their presence and helpfulness. Was it not Tinteretto who in painting a head of the Christ filled up the background of his picture with the infinitesimal heads of saints so that their watchful eyes might keep him from dealing irreverently with the sacred theme? What wonder that Luther once said :† “It was an incalculably bitter thing for me to break loose from the veneration of the saints; I was profoundly absorbed in it and completely saturated with its influence.” It was not only for the sake of peace, but from a spirit of pious regard for all believers, that the early Reformers made all possible concession on this vital question of dispute. The Augsburg Interim Art. XXIV.‡ may have been somewhat *too* conciliatory in the interests of genuine conservatism: “On the remembrance of the saints we hold that they pray to God for us and help us with their service.” Ground somewhat similar to this was taken by

*George Eliot never wrote a tenderer sentence.

†Works, Erlangen, 65 : 120.

‡Herzog, 1 : 612.

the Leipsic Interim. Even Melanchthon concedes that the Augsburg Confession itself may leave a loop-hole to suppose that the saints in heaven may pray for the church in general, *in genere*, with the qualifying remark, however, that such a notion has no stronger testimony in the word of God than the dream of the great Maccabean general.*

So then it is at least an error of judgment on the part of Cardinal Gibbons† when he claims "that the Reformers of the sixteenth century, in denying the communion of saints, not only inflicted a deadly wound on the Creed, but also severed the tenderest cords of the human heart. They broke asunder the holy ties that united earth with heaven, and the soul in the flesh with the soul released from the flesh." The indignant answer of Chemnitz‡ to this long exploded charge may suffice: "It is false that we dishonor the saints or allow them insufficient regard as if their remembrance were not to be celebrated. But our complaint is against the Papal Church, because she neither retains, fosters, nor demands the honor of the saints as defended in the word of God, but obscures, perverts and destroys it."

And this is not only the teaching of the Confession itself, but of all its expositors and apologists. The Church can safely afford to stand by the interpretation. Walch§ gives a list of authorities to show that the Augustana does not stand alone on this doctrinal platform. It is the general doctrine of Protestantism, the *catena* of sound scriptural teaching, the *consensus doctorum* of Evangelicalism,|| that the saints should be held in remembrance because thereby (a) God is honored, (b) our faith confirmed, (c) and their lives ennobled.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DOGMA.

But the foregoing is not the doctrine of the Papal Church. The Confession's remembrance of the saints is entirely inadequate in the estimation of Roman Catholic theologians. It did not satisfy the Confutators even proximately. Whilst they

*2 Mac. 2 : 14, 15.

†Faith of our Fathers, 190.

‡Examen, Pt. III., Sec. I.

§In Libros Ecc. Luth. Sym., Cap. 111, 329.

||See also Guericke: Christliche Symbolik, 235, and Winer: Confessions of Christendom, 68 f.

agreed to ten articles of the *Augustana*, disputed the doctrinal tendency of seven, and partially condemned three, this one they rejected *in toto—simpliciter damnant* as Melancthon sententially observes. With them the *Cultus Sanctorum* was not a question of honoring the saints, but worshiping them, not of remembrance but veneration, not of commendation but adoration. They would not agree, says Walch, to the most reasonable concessions or conservative limitations. Tittman argues that they were compelled to take this stand or abandon their church. Plitt affirms that Eck charged against the evangelicals sixteen errors with regard to the saints, and would not listen to the mention of a reconciliation. A glance at the subject as elucidated and defended by such profound thinkers of to-day as Cardinal Newman, the editors of the *Dublin Review*, Cardinal Gibbons, forces any one to the conclusion that if this dogma were yielded by Romanists, the strongest link in the chain of their teaching would be broken. "The profoundest of the causes which separate the Churches lies in the Mariolatry and saint-worship of Rome; while most of the other controversies involve only the means and appliances of worship, this relates to the very object and end of it."* The question whether the saints should be religiously invoked and adored they settle with the most positive and irreversible affirmative.

1. *The Council of Trent*† in its twenty-fifth session, December, 1563, formulated the floating theories and opinions as follows: "On the invocation of saints, the holy synod enjoins on all bishops and others who sustain the office and charge of teaching, that, agreeably to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and agreeably to the consent of the holy fathers and the decrees of the sacred councils * * they especially instruct the faithful concerning the invocation and intercession of the saints; the honor paid to relics; and the legitimate use of images; teaching them, that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have re-

*Jenkins; Romanism of Pius IV., 189.

†Schaff: Creeds of Christendom, Vol. II., 199.

course to their prayers, aid and help for obtaining benefits from God through his son Jesus Christ our Lord who is our alone Redeemer and Saviour; but that they think impiously who deny that the saints who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or who assert either that they do not pray for men; or that the invocation of them to pray for each of us in particular is idolatry; or that it is repugnant to the word of God, and is opposed to the honor of the *one mediator of God and men, Christ Jesus*; or that it is foolish to supplicate, vocally or mentally, those who reign in heaven."

It will be noticed here that the assistance of the saints is a theory, not founded on the Bible—but on their imagined co-regency with Christ—*una cum Christo regnantes*—and intercessory rights; and their invocation is "good and useful" rather than necessary and indispensable. In so far the Tridentine deliverance differs from the Greek Confession* of Peter Mogila,† who pronounces prayer to the saints a *chreos*—necessity and makes Mary and the other saints a *meseteia*—mediation with God.

2. We are, however, not limited to the decree of the Council of Trent for a knowledge of the papistical understanding of this system. It receives ample elucidation in the devotional and educational books authorized by the Church. In the *Psalter of Bonaventura*,‡ for instance, we find characteristic improvements on some of the Psalms. On the I. Psalm: "Blessed they who love thy name, O virgin Mary!" On the VII.: "O most excellent lady in thee do I put my trust." On the XIX.: "The heavens declare thy glory, O Virgin Mary." On the CX.: "The Lord said unto my most excellent lady: My mother sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy foot-stool." These are a few specimens from an abundant mass of similar supplicatory addresses. The *Catechismus Concilii Tridentini*, the primer of religious instruction for the youths of the Romish communion, ascribes divine worship to the angels and apostles.§

*Guericke: Christliche Symbolik, 244.

†The symbolic book of the Eastern Church.

‡Chemnitz, without passing judgment on its merits, gives the most complete synopsis of this book to be found. See Examen: Pt. III., Sec. II.

§Leipsic Edition, 1851.

The *Breviary* which was prepared under a decree of the Council of Trent and sanctioned by numerous papal ordinances, though full of legends, if not offensive to good taste, morals and sense, nevertheless unprofitable,* yet acknowledged with praise by Dr. Newman,† contains a prayer‡ which ascribes equal honor to the saints with the Father and the Son. In the *Litany of the Saints*,§ as found in one of the latest missals, there is an *ora pro nobis* for fifty-one saints with specified names from St. Michael to Santa Anastasia, besides all the holy angels and archangels, patriarchs and prophets, holy apostles and evangelists, holy innocents, bishops, confessors, monks and hermits, all of whom are invited to be mediators with God even though the Vulgate itself says: "There is *one* mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus." A *Litany* of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries contains similar ascriptions—a notable one to St. Laurentius: "O thou who wast roasted alive, come, bring consolation to us miserable ones."||

3. These expressions are not repudiated but defended by the highest authorities in the Church of Rome. Pope Pius IV.§ says: "I believe likewise that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honored and invoked." Alphonso Liguori,** who was himself canonized by Pope Gregory XVI., invoked the Virgin Mary as queen of heaven: "Save me, O powerful queen, save me by the intercession of thy son." Gregory XVI. closes a letter:†† "Let us raise our eyes to the most blessed Virgin Mary * * who is our greatest hope, yea the entire ground of our hope." Cardinal Newman,‡‡ interpreting saint-worship as the central doctrine of Athanasius, says: "The sanctification or rather deification of the nature of man is the main subject of his theology." And in his exposition of Father Segneri's the-

*Miracles and Saints, 79. †Development of Christian Doctrine, 411.

‡Sacrosanctae et individuae Trinitati, Crucifixi Domini nostri Jesu Christi humanitati, beatissimae et gloriosissimae semperque Virginis Mariae foecundae integritati et omnium sanctorum universitati, sit sempiterna laus, honor, virtus et gloria ab omni creatura.

§Cathcart: The Papal System, 309.

||Vilmar: Geschichte der Deutschen National Literatur, 578.

¶Cumming, 297. **Ibid, 299. ††Ibid, 301. ‡‡Development, 140.

ology he acquiesces in the opinion that "all the saints have participated sonship, divinity, glory, holiness and worship."*

4. A few instances of the practical working of the system will demonstrate how tenaciously it has taken hold of the minds of its advocates and how deeply it is rooted in their religious instincts. A refusal to adopt it incurs at least the suspicion of heresy. The Church condemns all who in any wise hesitate to accept the decree of the Council of Trent. Pope† Benedict XIV. intimates that disparaging the worship of saints is, if not a positive heresy, at least a sin of unbelief, and further says, "that whosoever shall dare to assert that the pope has erred in this or that canonization, brings scandal upon the whole church, is a maintainer of an erroneous proposition and deserving of the severest punishment." That these covered threats of excommunication are carefully remembered by the laity is manifest from the universal silence in regard to the most offensive superstitions. Some of the most conciliatory writers feign to disclaim them, but no one ventures now to discountenance them. In truth, the Romish Party in their *Confutation* of this 21st Art. of the Augsburg Confession—1530—*take pleasure* in showing that the Albigenses, Picards, and other heretics, new and old, were deservedly condemned for their opposition to worshiping the saints. Even Cardinal Gibbons‡ goes no farther than to say: "There are expressions addressed to the saints in popular books of devotion, which, to critical readers, may seem extravagant. But they are only the warm language of affection and poetry and are to be regulated by our standard of faith." But what care the devout Calabrian and Sicilian assassins and robbers for the "standard of the faith?" They join the honest peasantry and artisans who flock around the shrine of an imaginary saint and bother little about the sophistical distinctions of theorizing ecclesiastics. As late as 1872 a pilgrimage, comprising in its successive divisions two hundred thousand people, was organized in France to do homage to St. Philomena, "the thaumaturgist of the nineteenth century," and to the virgin of La Salette,

*Ibid, 435.

†Mediæval and Modern Miracles and Saints, 74.

‡Faith of our Fathers, 182.

and this by sanction of Pio Nono and the secret connivance of the French government.*

Gathering information from all available sources, viewing Roman Catholic teaching on all sides, confining ourselves to its own authorities, yet remaining within the bounds of fairness and justice to a Church numbering so many millions, to which our confessors at one time belonged, we come to the following summary of its faith on the invocation of saints:

1. The saints who have departed from this life are to be religiously invoked in calamity, addressed in prayer and worshiped in the conviction of their intercessory power. "Roman Catholics do not honor the saints with that worship only where-with we do men which excel in virtue, &c., but also with *divine* worship and honor, which is an act of religion."—*Bellarmin.*†

2. Of this adoration the saints are worthy because by their works of supererogation and superfluous merits they supplement our defectiveness, stand between the divine righteousness and human unworthiness and mitigate the severity of the one intercessor in order that we may become participants in the promises of God. "Because we believe in the communion of saints, therefore we hold communion with them in prayer, and because we pray to them they carry our prayers to God."‡—*Cardinal Gibbons.*

3. To this end all the faithful are admonished to an unwavering confidence that the beatified in heaven see, know, hear and understand all the special wishes of individuals, and the silent thoughts of the spirit, are near at hand in every moment and able to answer every petition. "Just as the mass and indulgences work for the good of the dead, so the saints through their intercessions work for the best of the living. They are in a similar way the mediators in heaven as the priests are upon the earth."—*Thomas Aquinas.*§

With this doctrine of saint-worship in Latin Christianity, agrees that of the Oriental Church. The Greeks invoke the Virgin Mary as the mother of God, the saints and martyrs as

*Mir. and Saints, 159.

†Quoted by Pusey in Eirenicon, 107.

‡Condensed from Faith of our Fathers, 181.

§Herzog: Encyklopædie, 16 : 71.

sub-mediators, the angels as protectors and defenders, and venerate relics and images as intermediate instrumentalities in the worship of the Trinity.* On minor points there is some slight diversity but the essential features are similar. At the Council of Florence the Roman Church was willing to receive the whole body of Eastern canonized saints.

THE ORIGIN OF SAINT WORSHIP.

How did the invocation of the saints originate? A historical inquiry, so far as we have access to the most authentic sources of antiquity, invests the subject with additional interest and exhibits its tendencies in clearer light.

In the Old Testament it is unknown. Said an eminent Rabbi in a recent sermon: "Israel has never forgotten its noble heroes, nor its martyrs. It has paid them their tribute of tears and mourns them still; but it never made saints of them; it never worshipped them; never preserved their relics and worked miracles with them." "The Hebrews† were allowed to pass to heaven, or purgatory, without any apotheosis or beatification." The young King Hezekiah quickly "brake in pieces the brazen serpent of Moses,"‡ contemptuously calling it "nehushtan," when he noticed the growing signs of idolatry among the people. Like Leo and Constantine and Theophilus he would shatter into fragments anything that detracted from the supreme honor of God. The religion of the true Hebrew was founded on one grand declaration: "Hear, O Israel,§ The Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve."|| This, according to Origen's reply to Celsus, excluded likewise angel-worship. After quoting the first commandment he says: "No one who obeys the law of Moses will bow down to the angels who are in heaven."¶

The best and most ancient authorities** maintain that the

*Guericke: Symbolik gives the original, 244.

†Edgar: Variations of Popery, 462.

‡2 Kings 18 : 4.

§Deut. 6 : 4.

||Matt. 4 : 6.

¶Ante-Nicene Fathers, IV : 545.

**Walch mentions in his *Introductio in Libros Ecc. Lutheranae Symbol.* as valuable: Chamierus in Panstrat, Catholic, tom II, lib. 20, cap. 7 : 409. Beblus: Antiq. Ecc. Secul, tom III, Art. 7 : 980.

early Christians were strangers to saint-worship—*ab invocatione sanctorum alieni*. Chemnitz* calmly and boldly affirms that in the best and purest times of the Church, *i. e.*, of Christ and his apostles—yea even in post-apostolic times—the invocation of saints is utterly unknown—*prorsus ignota*. With this statement corresponds the universal testimony of reliable Church History. In the first and second centuries of the Christian era it was perfectly natural that the memory of those believers, who had lost their lives in the persecutions on account of faith in the Christ, should be gratefully revered. The anniversary of their martyrdom was called their birth-day and was celebrated sometimes with enthusiastic fervency. The people assembled at the tombs of these martyrs to offer prayers to God and excite themselves to faith and patience by the solemn recollection of their virtues. Narratives of their confessions and sufferings would be read, the Lord's Supper would be frequently celebrated in commemoration of communion with the departed and the consciousness that they were resting from their labors and receiving their rewards in a conscious and continuous life with God. These observances, or *oblaciones, sacrificia pro martyribus*, originally presupposed that the martyrs were like all other fallible, sinful human beings, and not entitled to any superhuman or celestial honors. That there was not the least shadow of intercession, or invocation or worship, we gather from a description of Polycarp's martyrdom† in the middle of the second century. In their report the congregation at Smyrna say: "Be it known that by honoring the departed we neither leave our Saviour nor worship anyone else, but love the martyrs as they deserve for their unsurpassable love to their associates and fellow disciples." Of which touching and most important account Chemnitz remarks with positiveness: That it remains uncontradicted by any ecclesiastical information from those earliest times.§

Then,|| as the consciousness of lukewarmness and growing worldliness became more and more a reality in the Christian experience of the second and third centuries, there arose a long-

*Examen Conc. Tri. Pt. 3, 398. †Guericke: Christliche Symbolik, 231.

‡Neander: 1: 596.

§Examen, Pt. III., Sec. 5.

||Kurtz: Church History, 1: 221.

ing among the most faithful, after the piety and godly character of those who had died for their testimony to the faith. The more people declined in religious fervency the more they began to revere those who had been so far superior to them. Their memories would not only be privately treasured but transmitted to others. Memorials of them would be tenderly preserved;* their tombs would assume the nature of sanctity; their martyrdom would become more and more the season for popular celebration; the saints' days would become holidays. Thoughts upon thoughts in this line of meditation would follow: Having prayed for their fellows in life, it was unnatural that these departed would cease doing so after death. Their prayers had been intercessory in this world, why should they not be so in the next? Cyprian went so far as to ask the living to continue their intercessions for him after they had entered into their rest.† Nevertheless there is not yet the least manifestation of an invocation such as the papal dogma demands. The most rhetorical panegyrics were no more than rhetoric. Even the most pronounced opinions were only individual and private and not the public or authoritative deliverance of the Church. Not the least sign of Mariolatry had yet appeared. Pusey shows that the story of Justina "beseeching the mother of Christ to succor a virgin in peril from the assaults of, satan" is without foundation. And in the "Acts of the Martyrs" there is not one genuine instance where any of those terribly persecuted confessors of Jesus asked help amidst their superhuman sufferings except from God, or our Lord. The self-confident appeals to what the advocates of saint-worship call "patristic testimony" for its justification, have no better foundation than the traditional and legendary accounts of impossible and improbable saints.§ Jerome, whose angry opposition to Vigilantius is universally cited as an insuperable defense of the invocation of saints, has not a syllable

*Mozley: *Theory of Development*, 25.

†Chemnitz: *Examen*, Pt. 3, Sec. 5.

‡Eirenicon, 108.

§See *Vitae Patrum*, a book characterized by Mr. Lecky in a note to the fourth chapter of his "History of European Morals" as "one of the most fascinating volumes in the whole range of literature."

about *invocation* but simply speaks of honoring them.* Even Origen admits that if the saints in heaven do anything for us, it is included in the divine secrets and not recorded in human transactions. Even if they do pray for us that is no reason why we should invoke them; and in his controversy with Celsus he flings the impassioned rebuke into the face of this arch-enemy of Christ: "We must offer adoration to God alone."†

And yet it is he who sowed the first seeds of what afterwards ripened into one of the most popular and tenaciously supported of papal practices. Thoroughly imbued with Platonism‡ he believed as implicitly as any of the disciples of the great philosopher, that the souls of good and virtuous men after the decease of the body, are turned into angels or good demons, and fly about the world helping men and defending them from evils and mishaps. It was an easy matter to transfer this apparently innocent belief, with unimportant modifications, to the souls of the saints and make the philosophy of Plato an integral portion of the religion of Jesus. But that which won the approbation of educated heathenism for the time, developed in the next century into opinions which threatened to destroy the knowledge of Christ.

The first unmistakable manifestations of saint-worship in its modern signification appear at the close of the fourth century.§ It then became customary to address formal and personal appeals to the departed both in prayer and the orations on festival days. Basil, bishop of Caesarea, A. D. 370, stands foremost in practically appealing to the dead. In a eulogy pronounced over the martyrdom of forty soldiers by Julian the apostate, he suddenly broke forth: "O ye united defenders of the human family; ye exalted companions of suffering; ye fellow associates in prayer; ye mighty helpers!"|| But the Gregories quickly surpassed him in their declamatory eulogies. Nazianzen declares of Basil: "Now he is in heaven; now he sacrifices for us; now he prays for the people;" and the dead Athanasius he addressed: "But do thou look in mercy upon us from thy lofty dwelling

*Melancthon in Apology, 223.

†South: Vol. 2: 496.

‡Bossuet-Cramer: Einleitung.

†Chemnitz: Ex., Pt. 3, Sec. 5.

‡Chemnitz: Examen, Pt. 3, Sec. 5.

place!" Gregory of Nyssa in paying a eulogistic tribute to the martyr Theodore, cries out: "O blessed one, we implore thee to intercede for our Fatherland!"*

These are some of the causes which lie at the root of saint worship—namely the natural devotion to the memory of the martyrs—the deep longing in times of religious decadence after their wonderful attainments—the subtle influence of the Platonic philosophy on the educated mind and the growing power of superstition upon the masses. And it is of supreme significance that invocation did not obtain full sway until after the death of the church Fathers. They lived before the darkness of the middle ages obscured the pure spiritual life. Chemnitz sorrowfully laments that opposition to it ceased as the light of instruction expired and the night of superstition culminated in forgetfulness of God. After the death of Augustine the Church was delivered up, bound hand and foot, into this semi-heathenism. Peter Fullo who had been condemned by the fifth general synod, was the originator and first to introduce (470) saint-worship into the hymnals and litanies of the Church.† But it was not until the beginning of the seventh century when Gregory the Great‡ firmly and formally promulgated a new article of faith by adopting the cultus of the Virgin Mary and the other saints into the regulated public worship.

Its introduction into the Oriental Church occurred somewhat later and in the course of the iconoclastic controversies. John of Damascus had defended it beforehand on traditional grounds but it was not ecclesiastically adopted until the second Nicene Council in 787. And although the rise and progress of this "relic of heathenism," as some one expressively calls it, was very slow and subtle, its original germs fastening themselves in parasitic fashion on the young and vigorous growth of Christianity, nevertheless by the beginning of the fifteenth century it had enfolded the entire tree like a poison ivy striking its deadly ten-

*Bossuet-Cramer: *Einleitung in die Geschichte der Welt und Religion*, 4: 341.

†Chemnitz: *Examen*, Pt. 3, Sec. 5.

‡Tittman: *Augsburgische Confession*, 126.

§Guericke: *Christliche Symbolik*, 245.

drills into every fiber, sucking out the life forces of pure spiritual worship and threatening to deprive it of all its fruitfulness. Milman* tells us that the saints "intercepted the worship of the Almighty Father, the worship of the Divine Son. To them rather than through them prayer was addressed; their shrines received the more costly oblations; they were the rulers, the actual disposing Providence on earth."

And yet, if Protestants are permitted to judge according to the noted rule of Vincent de Lerins, viz: that whatsoever is Catholic must be adopted *semper, ubique, omnibus*, invocation of the saints was by no means universally accepted. Epiphanius severely reprehended it and classed it among the heresies. Chrysostom† repeatedly censured the disposition of the common people to have recourse to the saints in prayer. So did many others of prominence in the Greek Church. The twenty-fifth canon of the Council of Laodicea, in the fourth century, pronounced angelolatry idolatry. Helvidius,‡ an energetic reformer of the fourth century opposed it on the ground of Holy Scripture, reason and morality. Ambrose rejected it, in his best days, as a heathen superstition. The bitter controversy between Jerome and Vigilantius grew out of the latter's charge that to invoke the dead was ridiculous and heathenish.§ The views of Augustine—though he is claimed as a mighty defender—fairly stated, show that he thought it doubtful whether the dead, through God's power, participate in the affairs of the living; whether the saints can furnish assistance; prayers are not to be centered upon the dead, but upon the adorable and ever living God; catholic Christians adore no dead being; the apparent miracles at the tombs of the martyrs, if genuine, are the work of God; "whom shall I find that can reconcile me to God? Only the one true mediator, Jesus Christ who is my only hope."|| And the influence of his opinions was felt throughout the later history.

*Latin Christianity, Vol. IV., 13, 204.

†Chemnitz: Examen, Pt. 3, Sec. 5.

‡Herzog: 5, 730.

§Herzog: 5, 692.

||See Chemnitz, Pt. 3: Sec. 5, Chap. 3, for condensed passages from Augustine's writings.

Claudius of Turin, A. D. 820, petitioned the Emperor Ludwig to have the images taken from the churches and himself preached "like fire" against all visible mediators, admonishing the people to enter into communion with God through the one mediator, Jesus Christ.* Charlemagne (840) directed that no new saints should be catalogued for veneration.† Gundulph of northern France in the 10th century insisted that the saints had no miraculous power. Archbishop Guibert,‡ Chancellor of Emperor Henry III., vigorously wrote against it. One of the most pronounced elements of opposition on the part of all the sects in the middle ages, was war against saint worship as a corruption§ of primitive Christianity.

These utterances—manly and positive as they may be—are only the sporadic and unorganized protests of individual believers whose voices were speedily silenced by the edicts of councils, the anathemas of popes and the irresistible tendency of the increasing ecclesiasticism. It was left to the Confessors at Augsburg to frame a definite doctrinal statement against the invocation of the saints; and this they did on one insuperable and conclusive argument.

I. IT IS CONTRARY TO THE WORD OF GOD.

"The Scripture does not teach us to invoke saints or to seek aid from them." The language is brief but well chosen and decisive. In the true spirit of conciliation, they were prepared to let their case rest on this conservative utterance; but Luther the falcon-eyed leader of the Reformation was more far-seeing and gives added strength to the statement of the confessors. In the Smalcald Articles|| he says: "Saint worship is neither commanded nor advised and has no example in the Scriptures." The confutators vainly perverted "the law and testimony" to overthrow the evangelical argument. The Council of Trent does not pretend to supply any authority from God's word in support of its standpoint and Eck in his Manual for Catholic Christians expressly admits the fact, but passes it over as immaterial.

*Herzog, 17 : 191; Neander, 3 : 132.

‡Ibid.

†Neander.

||Mueller, 305.

‡Ibid.

Yet this was the impregnable fortress of the Reformers. It is a dishonor to the Church, says Chemnitz, to introduce or adopt an article of faith for which there is no safe, solid and unmistakable testimony in the canonical Scriptures; and this is of special importance in regard to prayer and worship, for here our relation to Divinity needs precise definitions. That Cardinal Gibbons considers this argument of the weightiest importance is plain enough in his attempted vindication of saintly invocation. Admitting some doubt about his reader being satisfied with quotations from the "ecclesiastical writers of the first ages" as proof of Roman Catholic teaching, he tacitly acknowledges the testimony of the Bible of essential importance. He says:† "If you have no doubt that the saints can *hear* your prayers and have the *power* and the *will* to assist you, you will readily admit that it is salutary to ask their intercessions." Then he adduces numerous texts to show that the saints hold communication with us, have the ability to aid us and are willing to exert their influence in our favor. He gives to his reasons the most plausible coloring, full of learning, wisdom and a truly Christian spirit; but there are three serious objections to his citations; and, as his are the citations upon which the Church of Rome has built whenever she attempted any scriptural defense of saint-worship, the objections to them will refute the usual appeals to divine authority in justification of this dogma. (1). Those passages which he urges with the greatest vehemence and plausibility are taken from the Apocryphal books. (2). Those which *are* canonical, do not, when subjected to the strictest rules of fair interpretation, settle his premises. (3). He cites not a solitary passage that directly commands invocation and those which positively forbid it he does not mention at all.

A brief examination of a few of these passages is demanded both on the score of fairness to our opponents and in proof of our own allegations. (1). Judas Maccabeus‡ in the night before his struggle with the impious Nicanor, in a dream beheld Onias the high-priest long since dead, standing with outstretched arms and praying for the people of God. But this book is apocry-

*Faith of our Fathers, 185.

†Chemnitz, Pt. III., Sec. 3.

‡II. Maccab. 15 : 14.

phal; Judas recites a dream to animate his troops—not an actual occurrence; it is not proven that Onias was cognizant of the individual and special circumstances of the people; neither Judas nor his army had invoked Onias but the Lord God of heaven and earth.* (2). Jacob on his death bed asked the angel to bless his two grandchildren.† Therefore we ought also to invoke the assistance of created beings, reasons Romanism. But Jacob here invoked the benediction of an uncreated Being—the *Malak Jehovah*—the Second Person in the Trinity, as Luther‡ has most conclusively shown, by clearly pointing out the use of the singular verb in Jacob's entire petition, which proves that he believed the angel to be one with his father's God and the God who had shepherded him in his weary pilgrimage. (3). The fathers of the old Covenant frequently made use of the names and merits of the patriarchs in their appeals to Jehovah.§ Hence we should make similar use of the saints. But it was only and solely in God's covenant of promise to the patriarchs that these ancient people consciously reposed the guaranty of his gracious and holy guidance, hence in their prayers they did not appeal to the merits of their forefathers but to the merciful promises of the Lord.|| (4). Numerous passages¶ are cited by the controversialists to show that intercessions should be made for all the saints. But the two men—whom no one ranks in logical and spiritual acumen to interpret the word of God—Chemnitz and Gerhard—unquestionably prove that these quotations from the sacred writers refer expressly to the prayers of the living for the living, and that of prayer by those who have entered into their rest there is neither an admonition or example or promise in the canonical Scriptures. (5). There was shown to the Revelator** a golden bowl of incense—the prayers of the saints. But these are the ascriptions of glory the saints render

*Gerhard: *Loci Theologici*, 27: cap. 8, page 96.

†Gen. 48: 16.

‡Speaker's Commentary, *in loco*.

§An instance: Gen. 32: 9.

||Oehler, O. T. Theology, 66.

¶1 Tim. 2, compared with Rom. 15; Col. 4; James 5; Gen. 18 and 20; Job 42; Ezekiel 22.

**Rev. 5: 8.

to God in heaven—their prayers to God, not the petitions of mundane supplicants *to them* on account of which they should be invoked, sacrifices offered to them, holidays appointed to their honor; churches, altars and monasteries erected to their exaltation. (6). God answered to Jeremiah's supplication* for mercy on the Jewish nation: "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people;" and does not that indicate God's readiness to hear the intercessions of the dead? The truth conveyed is that idolatry is such a dreadful thing that even the living presence of these great law-givers could not save the guilty. (7). The reprobate Dives^o in the place of torment could hold communication with the just Abraham in Paradise, why can there not then be interchange of thought between the saints in heaven and their brethren on the earth? And this is absolutely the only instance of intercession to a saint recorded in God's word; and it is utterly rejected; the example is not encouraging.

There is absolutely no mention in Scripture of any *examples* giving the least encouragement to invocation. On the contrary wherever celestial beings appeared upon earth all attempts at adoration were resisted. The same abhorrence shown by Paul and Barnabas at Lystra† and Peter's gentle but peremptory rebuke of Cornelius,‡ in the face of worshipful prostration, appears in the instances of attempted angelic adoration. When John fell down to worship before the feet of the angel the latter charged: "See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brothers the prophets: *worship God.*"§

Neither is there any ground of proof in favor of invocation of created beings in the case of the Theophanies which form a prominent feature in the early history of the Old Testament Scriptures and which are repeatedly cited by Roman Catholic writers to justify their system of worship. Cardinal Newman, for instance, appealing to Augustine, affirms that here is the natural introduction to the *Cultus Sanctorum*|| and the primary ground from which the development of the doctrine has arisen. He maintains that those visible appearances were creatures, no

*Jeremiah 15 : 1. ^oLuke 16 : 24. †Acts 14 : 15. ‡Acts 10 : 16.

§Rev. 22 : 8, 9, Vulgate. ||Development of Christian Doctrine, 138.

matter what they represented, and if so, then the patriarchs were the first who worshiped creatures, not indeed in themselves but as the token of the One greater than themselves. But is it not begging the question to affirm that these patriarchs consciously worshiped the Creator in the form of a creature? They prostrated themselves before a Presence but did they assume it to be a created presence? Did not Moses hide his face because he was afraid to look upon God? Did not Jacob say: "I have seen God face to face?" There is absolutely nothing to show that they consciously worshiped the infinite Divinity hidden under the form of a secondary divinity; for in instances of their bowing down before a supposed created presence it was after the manner of an oriental obeisance, and not an exhibition of divine worship. But even on the supposition that they had rested their worship instrumentally upon the visible presence, and spiritually located it upon the invisible, it would none the less remain true as Mgr.* Pannilini, bishop of Chiusi, pointedly says: "Worship ought not to result in the object underlying it, (or rebound in it)—but be given to that object." And if there was an emphatic opposition to all idolatry in the patriarchal worship—as the Romish argument concedes—how much less ground for the least semblance for it now, since grace and truth have come by Jesus Christ.

Neither the pious appeals of Roman Catholic divines, nor the acute reasonings of the profoundest theologians, nor the infallible pronunciamientos of œcumenical councils have yet been able to answer the words of the Confessors. There is not an available sentence in the Bible, either of precept, example or promise, which they can fairly cite to favor saint-worship. On the contrary the entire system is unqualifiedly condemned by commandment, instruction and admonition. And if it be charged that Protestants in general and the Confessors in particular argued their own opinions into the word of God, the quick rejoinder that those opinions are consistent with that Word is just as true as the historical fact that the Confutators perverted the plain teachings of holy scripture and deduced from them utterly irra-

*Jenkins: *Romanism of Pius IV.*, 192.

tional conclusions, which, in defiance of reason and common sense, are defended as the abutments of papal authority.

But is the teaching of Holy Scripture sufficient? In answer to this question the Romish Church to-day produces, not officially it is true, but none the less gladly, that masterly work of John Henry Newman on the Development of Christian Doctrine. Its entire argument may be crystallized into the terse expression: "A doctrine to be catholic needs not be proven by Scripture; it is the product of the Church's life." It is implied that the sacred writings in themselves are inadequate and thus virtually admitted, on the one hand, that the early Christians were at a great disadvantage, and on the other there is demanded of us a belief in the grandest, most comprehensive and fascinating system of worship founded upon nothing substantially proven; built up after the manner of scientific hypotheses and settled by the laws of an ecclesiastical evolution! Thus, as Dr. Tulloch* happily expresses it, the author of the "development theory" and mightiest apologist for the central doctrine of Roman Catholicism, with his ardent followers, has rummaged about among the debris of ancient and mediaeval uncertainty instead of throwing the bright light of his grand intellect and the fervor of his warm heart upon the living pages of the New Testament. The development of a doctrine rooted and grounded in nothing but a traditional faith, is not a sufficient justification for its acceptance in practice. Too many intellectual leaps over unbridged chasms are needed; too many demands to enter the shadowy realms of credulity for the heart accustomed to confide in the infallible alone.

Furthermore, though there be manifest everywhere a law of development and abounding evidences of physical, ethical, ecclesiastical and theological evolution, nevertheless the idea of degeneracy has established itself just as familiarly in our minds. Growth, in its unfolding realities, strikes us as most common; so does corruption in all its disgusting forms. We see things becoming better, we also see them getting worse; and some that have been better at first have assumed sad deterioration af-

*Religious Thought in Britain in the 19th Century.

terwards. Deflections arise, and then the departure from the straight line may be insensible at first, but none the less fatal in its steadiness. No reasonable human being will undertake to frame a denial to this sure law of decadence. When Dr. Newman,* therefore, asks us to believe that invocation of the saints is a necessary development from primitive Christian worship we may respectfully ask him to prove to us that it is not a divergence from the practice of the apostles and their successors.

At any rate, what was the office of our divine Lord as the great Teacher, but that of a perfect revealer of the whole truth as to God and his worship? Whatever the Father willed to disclose to man the Son made known in all its completeness. After his resurrection the Holy Ghost assumed the revealing work and taught the apostles the same divine truth. The Lord himself had said to his apostles: "He shall teach you the whole truth, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you.†" "The Church of this day can not know more than St. John," says Pusey, "else the promise would not have been fulfilled to him."‡

II. INVOCATION OF THE SAINTS DEROGATORY TO THE GLORY OF CHRIST.

From the word of God as a sufficient revelation against the invocation of saints we naturally turn to the Redeemer of mankind there revealed. The Confessors make this the next link in their argument. They say: "*The Scripture proposes Christ to us as our only Mediator, Propitiation, High Priest and Intercessor.*" In thus emphasizing the characteristic offices of the true Messiah, they ascribe to him all mediatorial glory. They can permit no subordinate, or co-mediators, as Harms§ calls them. Luther|| states incisively in the Smalcald Articles that the invocation of the saints "is a part of the abuses and errors of anti-christ and destroys the true knowledge of Christ as the Redeemer;" and in one of his sermons he adds that "inasmuch as people lost their hold on Christ and thought him rude and un-

*See Canon Mozley in "Theory of Development," page 5 f.

†John 14 : 26.

‡Eirenicon, 85.

§Mit-Mittler und Nebenmittler.

||Mueller.

gracious, they turned to the saints, supposing that they could by their exertions soften the acerbity of him who once said: 'Come unto me all ye who are weary and heavy laden.'" And by that act they undermine the mediatorial authority of Christ and rob him of the prerogatives of his sole mediatorship.

But there can be only one mediator. "The redeeming Saviour, whose destiny is to restore the fellowship with God interrupted by sin, must stand on the one hand in perfect fellowship with the human race and on the other hand in perfect fellowship with God. Otherwise he can not form a bond of union between the two." Now it is inconceivable that a created being, glorified or unglorified, can stand at the same time in a relation of *perfect unity* with the human race and also in a relation of antithesis to that race, not simply because he alone in the midst of a sinful world was without sin, but because no one can come to the Father except through him. He alone is the *giver*; all others are *receivers*. The lucid unfolding of this soteriological position by Martensen* is a conclusive commentary on the declaration of St. Paul: "For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." The glory of the only begotten one can not be understood unless we start with this conception of one God and one mediator. On this point the teaching of the Confession is so specific and so unmistakably consistent with the teaching of God's word, that the confutators involuntarily acknowledged its logical conclusiveness by coining a distinction between a mediator of redemption and a mediator of intercession, in order to justify the employment of saints and yet keep up the appearance that it is not derogatory to the honor of Christ nor inconsistent with his sole mediatorship. But there is not a vestige of any such distinction to be found in the sacred Scriptures. Carpzo† in commenting on 1 Timothy, 3 : 5 quoted above, asserts that mediator of redemption and mediator of intercession are one and the same thing and fortifies himself by quoting the authority of Origen, Augustine and Isidore of Seville. Better yet is the authority of the New Testament. "Lord to whom

*Christian Dogmatics, 259.

†Isagoge in libros, etc., 545.

shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."* "I am the way and the truth and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me."† "In none other is there salvation; for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved."‡ And that we need no other mediator requires no specific statement when we remember that Jesus Christ is both God and man,§ that he gave himself a ransom for the sin of the world|| and that the Father has accepted him as having perfectly answered the demands of the law.¶ The writings of the "Fathers" are a vast apologetic library on the all-sufficiency of Jesus Christ as the Saviour of mankind. And the deepest soul longings, the purest consciousness of realized salvation, as recorded in sacred song, constitute unceasing testimony to the saving power of the Son of God. What a mass of Christology and truly precious soteriology in our best hymns! "Thou, O Christ, art all I want." "Light, riches, healing of the mind, Yea, all I need in thee I find." "Jesus, my Advocate above, my Friend before the throne of love." "Thou must save and thou alone."

If there is one essential more completely fortified in Scripture than another it is this one of our salvation being possible solely and entirely on the merits of the God-man. He is the propitiation for our sins. "Truly in the Lord our God is the salvation of Israel."** "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." Upon this one passage the Confessors rely for the confirmation of their doctrine.

But invocation of the saints presupposes their *intercessory powers*. This is indeed the central position of the doctrine so far as it touches the work of the Redeemer. So diametrically opposed to each other are Protestantism and Catholicism at this point that when the former says: "The Israelites of old had no clear knowledge, as we have, of one great mediator, who is making intercession for us, *and yet* they sought not the good offices of the superhuman beings of whose existence they had no doubt, the latter replies *and therefore*†† they made no appli-

*John 6 : 68. †Ibid, 14 : 6. ‡Acts 4 : 12. §John 8 : 58; Matt. 16 : 13.

||Matt. 17 : 5.

¶Rom. 3 : 25 and 1 Jno. 4 : 10.

**Jeremiah 3 : 23 and 1 Jno. 2 : 1. ††*Dublin Review*, Mar. 1883, 55.

cation to them for aid." They knew so little of Christ *and yet* did not call upon the spirits of the departed, say the Confessors; the Confutators answer because they knew so little of him *therefore* they failed to invoke those who had been saved by faith in his name. The Augsburg Confession teaches that there is only one intercessor on whom we are to call and he promises that he will hear our prayers. He should be called upon in every affliction. The dogma of Rome is that angels and the saints, at whose head is the Virgin, intercede for us, and being able to hear and answer our petitions "it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them and to have recourse to their prayers." Komish dogmaticians in unfolding and enforcing this proposition as an indispensable part of their cultus, appeal to three very important considerations.

1. *The divine method of governing the universe.* With much earnestness and some plausibility it is argued that just as the Father in his creative and providential capacity employs the laws of nature for the administration of his purposes, so in the administration of his moral purposes he employs the agency of angels whom he has created as his ministering spirits. And just as Jesus uses the sacraments which he himself has instituted, and the prayers of the Church militant to promote the edification of the faithful so he employs the intercessions of the church triumphant for their protection in calamity. "Who can doubt," asks the Roman Catechism, "that the saints take upon themselves the work of our defence, when he beholds the miracles wrought at their graves, the blind having received their sight, the lame healing, the dead brought to life, and devils expelled from their bodies?"* The analogy is not well taken; if the reasoning were conclusive we might inquire whether our prayers for temporal blessings should not be addressed to the laws of nature, inasmuch as our petitions for spiritual blessings are to rise to the angels and the saints. But the dishonor to Christ involved in such a pantheistic worship is not its only objection. Aside from its uselessness there is the reflex injuriousness arising from all selfish devotion. The heart which is for-

*Berger: *Evangelischer Glaube*, 273.

ever crying after blessings is not the heart in which dwells the Saviour formed the "hope of glory." And although these saints and angels are "ministering spirits," whereas the laws of nature are but "blind forces," both are equally the messengers of God and *He* is to be invoked for their intervention—the agent not the agencies.

2. *Human sinfulness as against Christ's holiness* makes the intercessions of the saints necessary. Our sins render us very unworthy to come immediately to Christ himself who is unreconcilable because of his immaculate purity, terribly displeased because of our transgressions. Luther attributed to this most foolish and erroneous notion the dreadful tenacity and commercial value saint-worship assumed in his day. People in their God-forgetfulness stood in terror of the judgment and readily consented to pacify some tutelary inter-mediator to gain the benefits of his intercessions. The utter unreasonableness of this argument ought to make an appeal to the word of God unnecessary. Yet, does not Christ know them whom he invites and commands to come to him? * "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name that will I do." † "Who is he that shall condemn? It is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." ‡ Indeed the entire Epistle to the Hebrews is a most precious demonstration that Jesus is the compassionate High Priest, capable of entering into intensest sympathy with every one. The Romanist maintains that the concern of his saint for him intensifies when he is translated from the here to the afterward, but the love of Him who rescued that saint is chilled by his ascension into heaven! We have not so learned Christ. "I will not leave you comfortless. I will come to you." §

3. *The incarnation of Christ* is regarded among Catholics as the invincible argument in favor of the *Cultus Sanctorum*. Christ is the God-man. The son of God became the son of man. The divine entered into union with the human and by virtue of this union the human partakes of at least certain com-

*Matt. 11 : 28.

†Jno. 15 : 16.

‡Rom. 8 : 34.

§Jno. 14 : 18.

municable qualities of the divine. As the divinity has become incarnated into the human nature so the humanity has become implanted into the divine, hence there is a divine humanity at the head of which stands the second person of the Trinity—the living bond of inter-communion between God and the redeemed race. All the saints are therefore constantly with him and participate in his activities. The entire host make out a sort of halo about him; each one partakes of the instinctive omniscience of Christ; wherever he goes they go; whatever he does they do; on earth infirmity clung to them; on high their being is made perfect, and they carry freely out that great part which here below they but rehearsed, and when the Scripture says: "The Spirit maketh intercession for us," the meaning is the host of saints is praying for us, for the spirit is the life of the Church.*

The charge against Protestants is ignorance of the meaning and logical tendencies of the incarnation. If they understood the vast significance of this transaction they could not help but join in directing their supplications to the dead in Christ and make that a fundamental doctrine of Christianity.

The thought demands sober treatment, reserved, if critical; reverent, if bold; "for nothing which has ever interested humanity or profoundly moved it, is treated with contempt by a wise and good man."† The difficulty lies not in denouncing the assumption but in apprehending it; disputants who are more intent on assailing others than defending themselves will rather make loop-holes for the enemy than a way for their own escape. *Audi partem alteram.*

The profound importance of the incarnation on the cultus of the saints can not be belittled with a sneer. Doubtless much of the Bible notion of man's relation to God has been obscured by theological bias. Thus the Johannic immanence of God has been obscured by the Agustinian transcendence. But the theology which removes God to an infinite distance from man does not harmonize with the philosophically and *humanely* fascinating thought of Scripture that God is very near at hand—in whom we live and move and have our being.

* *Dublin Review*, Mar. 1853, 44.

† Tulloch: 19th Century, 9.

But what is more to the point is, that if the incarnation of Jesus implies an incarnation in the case of every believer, even in a limited sense, then Christianity is analogous to Buddhism* which teaches unlimited incarnations,—for every celebrated teacher is a Buddha. Probably the advocates of the invocation theory would not deny this inference since the infallible church has enrolled in her martyrologies the two oriental (mythical) saints, Josaphat and Barlaam, though Max Mueller† has shown that they are identical with Sakya-Mouni, the divine founder of Buddhism, and one of his apostles.

Nevertheless Möhler answers: "They who would worship Christ, must invoke the saints," on the supposition that He dwells in them. And at the head of the great host stands the Virgin Mary—the mirror of purest womanhood, as says St. Ambrose, the impersonation of all virtue * * * the celestial exemplar of all grace, the *Theotokos*—mother of God. Protestants do honor her above all in the ranks of womankind; they allow her all legitimate exaltation; in no sense are they reluctant to sound the praises of the "Madonna who bore the child." To them she is a nobler ideal than to hosts of her worshippers. For, do her Roman Catholic devotees venerate her piety, or renunciation of the world, or charity, or self-sacrificing devotion as a woman and a mother? By no means; but because she is supposed to be capable of miraculous power, there is this lofty adoration. Who is the Madonna in that Church to-day? Is it the lowly virgin who said: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy Word?"‡ Is it the silent, self-renouncing, willingly obedient mother of the Redeemer as she is painted to us in the Gospel of St. John? Is it her pious earthly life which all their representations portray? Not at all. *The Madonna is invoked for her ability to protect and her special intercession with the son of God. An impartial study of this Virgin-cultus leaves the indelible impression that the mother is greater than the Son, capable of more efficient sympathy, quicker to hear and answer prayer and a mightier

* *Andover Review*, Mar. 1886, 310.

† *Contemporary Review*, July '70, 580. See also *Miracles and Saints*, 44.

‡ Luke 1: 38.

and more intimate friend and helper. This is the logical sequence of the Romish treatment of the incarnation. Adopt its conclusions, especially that it virtually deifies whosoever is baptized into Christ, and you will be compelled to admit one of the most potent arguments in favor not only of Mariolatry but hagiolatry in their unconditioned signification. That is to say, *in calamities*, which are the expressions of God's anger, the people must get near to some one who is close to God and has influence with him—close to some one of the secondary intercessors. Even Dean Stanley traces back the longing after communion with some one near the great Invisible, to the passion, the vehemence, the urgency of some great sorrow like that of the French Christians in the fifteenth century uttering their piteous supplications for deliverance. The reply of Canon Liddon* is sufficiently forceful in its conclusiveness: "Sorrow of itself does not make the prayers which it multiplies or intensifies, either lawful or availing. Sorrow may quicken the instincts of superstition."

But even here the Scriptures must remain the legitimate argument. Belief in the intercession of the saints is an evidence of unbelief in the complete and all-sufficient intercession of the Lord Jesus himself. Even in the darkness of the ninth century Agobard of Lyons† said: "Since no man is essentially God, save Jesus our Saviour, so we, as Scripture commands, should bow our knees to his name alone lest by giving this honor to another, God may consider us estranged from him." "He ever liveth to make intercession for them."‡ "And thus saith the Lord.§ Cursed is the man that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm and whose heart departeth from the Lord." Such denunciation of all unauthorized reliance upon human beings and their religious veneration was loudly applauded in the early church. Tertullian|| asks: "Who permits you to accord to man that which has been reserved for the Deity? The martyr has enough to do with his own deficiencies. Who but the son of God has delivered another from the power of death!" And

*Bampton Lectures, 1866, p. 528.

†Neander, 3 : 429.

‡Heb. 7 : 24, 25.

§Jeremiah 17 : 5.

||Carpzov, 540.

Augustine: "Make no religion of the worship of dead men, for, if they lived piously, they look not for such an honor, but want us to honor Him through whom they are able to rejoice in the light of truth." This decided opposition, little regarded by the ecclesiastical powers, but continued for many centuries, proves that pious Roman Catholics preferred to trust themselves immediately to the intercession of Jesus rather than to the intermediary prayers of the saints. The ingenious German poet, *Angelus, Silesius*,* though he had renounced the Protestant Church, nevertheless cries out:

"Weg, weg, ihr Seraphim! ihr könnt mich nicht erquickeln!
Weg, weg, ihr Heiligen! und was an euch thut blicken.
Ich will nun eurer nicht: ich werfe mich allein
Ins ungeschaffne Meer der bloßen Gottheit ein."

And what is of equally serious consideration, the invasion of the prerogatives of Christ's mediatorial office by the admission of these numberless intercessors introduces an element of uncertainty into our own relations with Christ. The seeker after grace and wisdom and strength knows precisely whither to turn when he is conscious of only One almighty deliverer and is unhampered by a multiplicity of inferior objects of worship. He need listen to one voice alone: "Come unto me." But who among the subordinate mediators is the one most likely to hear his supplications, St. Ann or St. Michael? Confusion and embarrassment must distract his worship and rob him of the assurance of faith. Erasmus relates that a suppliant whose tutelary saint was Nicolaus, and who, during a shipwreck, when in the most threatening danger each one was calling on his particular patron defender, feared that his own saint would either not hear his pressing petition (the ship was already sinking) or had to pay attention to others who were invoking him at the same time, or might not speedily enough obtain audience of God, turned away from him and offered his petition directly to the only Saviour.† Admit that this is but mockery. Is there not terrible significance in the incident and does it not speak incontestably for itself? Wickliffe‡ saw the subject in the same light: "The devil may work in the pretended saints.§ The soul becomes

*Hase, 306.

‡Neander.

†Tittman: Augsburgi Confessio, 128.

§1 Tim. 4: 1.

distracted by the multitudes of saints who are recommended for invocation. It may likewise turn out that the foolish devotee is worshipping a canonized devil." And Luther asks: "Why will you forsake the safe and certain and worry with that which has neither merit or necessity or command?"* And does not this uncertainty grow into a crime when we consider the perilous loss of time which such indirect devotion involves? Every member of the Church of Rome claims that all our direct worship and service belongs to God and his Christ; but where, amid the few fragments of time allotted us on earth and our manifold engagements, shall even the most devoted Christians find time to divide their devotions between the direct and indirect.

Here we may stop long enough to emphasize the irresistible conclusion that invocation of the saints is *illogical, unnecessary, and useless*. It has no solid foundation in reason. Being contrary to the contents of the divine revelation it must stand in conflict with the enlightened and unprejudiced understanding. The laws of thought and promptings of the heart contradict its claims. The God who speaks in his word speaks also in his rational creations. And that it is unreasonable to demand our worship for those creations after their transition into the unseen world, must be manifest from their very nature. The saints in heaven differ in no vital particular from those on earth as concerns their attributes. Canonization even can not communicate to them any extra endowments, can not remove external and internal obstacles, can not remedy the essential limitations. Romanism without giving the proof, asserts that it can; Protestantism replies it can not because the Bible nowhere gives the least intimation of any such a prerogative or of any added rights and powers after death. Have the saints any knowledge of our circumstances? This involves the question of their omniscience and omnipotence, at least ubiquity, perpetual cognizance, hearing prayer, reading the heart.† They are either in possession of these divine attributes or they are not. If they are not, then worshipping them is the baldest and most useless superstition. True the Council of Trent conditions the promulgation of this dogma on the abandonment of all superstition

*Works, 53 : 139.

†*Dublin Review*, 1853, p. 48 f.

but remains shrewdly silent as to what manifestations of super-stition are intended.

But Romanists* insist that the saints do possess all the necessary attributes for intercommunication with the faithful; they know all about us; distance is but an accidental interruption; space can not interfere in intellectual communication; it is absurd to suppose that matter can constitute any obstacle to spiritual communication between earth and heaven. The blind man can not see his friend but that does not imply that his friend has lost the power of seeing him. If however the blind man knows anything he is conscious that his friend can see him without the power of seeing all things and be present with him without being everywhere present. It is easy enough to see that the Romish reasoning rests on probabilities, and the principle of probability doubtless plays an important part in many a man's religion; but this is no more than a process of "make believe," as Tulloch characterizes the theory of Newman and his followers. Only assent strongly to anything and the power of intellectual creativeness may in time project it as a reality to the vision of the credulous. Does not my friend of whom I have heard nothing for twenty years pray for me any more? Granted he does; but *what* special petitions does he offer in my behalf? My circumstances are entirely changed. Does not my father who died when I was a lad of fourteen, intercede for me any longer? But how shall he know the present character of my environments, which he must know if his intercessions are to have any practical efficacy? Praying *in general* is not the key-note of this system of worship. Protestants readily admit that the saints are in a conscious state of existence, and that the departed in the church triumphant belong to the same mystical body with those in the church militant, but that the spirits of the dead are accessible to those of the living, capable of hearing their prayers, knowing their thoughts, and answering their requests, they can not admit as a reason to invoke their intercession *unless it be unmistakably demonstrated by divine teaching*. Even Cardinal Cajetan admits that "we have no certain knowledge as to whether

*Milman, History of Christianity: Book IV, 426.

the saints are aware of our prayers."* Prayer to them is an act of worship, but an untrammelled and unbiased heart demands a distinct revelation or an express injunction for such an act of worship. The soul does not want to be launched out on an ocean of follies and phantasies. Why should any one leave the known for the unknown? There is a profound reason in the prayer of that German unbeliever: "Oh God, if thou art, reveal thyself unto me!" It is God's nature to reveal himself to his pleading children. But for how many centuries already have devout saint-worshippers fruitlessly cried to some departed one for only a word from the unknown. The eternal silence remains unbroken. "And Elijah said unto Elisha, Ask what I shall do for thee BEFORE *I shall be taken away from thee.*"† The eyes of King Josiah were *not to see* the evil coming upon his nation.‡ "Thou art our father though Abraham be ignorant of us."§ Says Winer: "If the Romanists are misapprehended they are themselves to blame,"|| for in defining their positions they use words which imply everything Protestants charge against them. And the subterfuges,¶ to which the Roman clergy are compelled to resort, to show how the saints may become cognizant of the wants and wishes of men, is a virtual confession on their part that nothing is known or can be known in regard to their status in the unseen world.

III. SAINT-WORSHIP DEGRADES THE SPIRITUAL WORSHIP OF GOD.

"And this," the Confession says, "is the loftiest worship according to the word of God." Consequently, the invocation of the saints infringes on the divine attributes, is subversive of the supreme authority of God and undermines the necessity of spiritual worship. In the formulation of systems of worship all orthodox churches agree that adoration belongs to God alone. "But as the Catholic and Greek churches in all formal elements of their doctrinal system have ranged the human side by side

*Quoted from his *Secund. Secundae* by Jenkins On Romanism, 194.

†2 Kings 2 : 9.

‡2 Kings 22 : 20.

§Isaiah 53 : 16.

||The Confessions of Christendom, 68.

¶Dr. Hodge discusses these fully in "Systematic Theology," Vol. III, p. 283.

yea exalted it above the divine in revelation. So in this special part of their cultus, they substantially present a human element for worship in the religious veneration they accord to the Virgin Mary, saints, images and relics."* The deliverances of the church on this subject virtually concede that it is not necessary to worship God alone. The Council of Trent impliedly pronounces refusal to invoke the saints a heresy, and the Protestant precept that God alone must be worshiped, a sin. But Justin Martyr† asks Trypho: "Do you think that any other one is said to be worthy of worship and called Lord and God in the Scriptures except the Maker of all, and Christ who by so many scriptures was proved to you to have become man?" And Theodoret tells us that "To Him alone who is God we must bring our worship." How these early Fathers bind all their thoughts to the revealed thought of God! But no wonder, for Christ condemned Samaritanism solely on the ground of trying to be independent of revelation. The advocacy of saint-worship rests on the same independence of divine teaching. We know what we worship; they think they know.

This is nothing less than an invasion of the unity and supremacy of God and an infringement on his attributes. That it was so understood by the Confessors is seen in their opinion that invocation of the saints was antagonistic to the first article of the Confession. How could that article stand, they ask, if a multitude of beings ranged themselves between the believer and God. Of course these Confessors were only fallible men, the adversaries charge, who constructed this doctrinal standpoint upon their own perverted theology. Let it be admitted that in according to the *Augustana* its rightful place we need not sanction everything its indiscreet admirers and indiscriminating laudators have written. If it is *not* a pyramid—its foundation article, the Trinity and its capstone, true worship; it is nevertheless a living organism, a colossal, pyramidal oak—its main stem the one grand thought, God in Christ working by his Spirit and all the other articles naturally and rationally growing out of that, branch-

*Guericke, 230.

†Ante Nicene Fathers, I, 232.

like—and all these the essential evolutionary outflow from the *Truth*, eternal, self-existent, absolute, as the tree itself grows from the ground in all its beauty and majestic stateliness. When it speaks here it only reiterates the declarations of God's word which tolerates no divided worship. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."* "The Lord thy God shalt thou fear and him alone shalt thou serve."† Here is no room either for image-worship or hagiodulia. Chemnitz‡ concedes to this argument the very first importance. "All the heathen methods are false and vain; they are so because it is impossible without the word of God and by the light of natural reason alone to understand true worship. Hence it is a most extraordinary and indescribable blessing of God that he has revealed in his word how he wishes to be invoked, and what kind of invocation is acceptable to him." What then is worship? What is Christian worship? Schleiermacher defines it thus: "The sum total of all actions whereby we present ourselves as organs of God by means of the Holy Spirit; it embraces all the virtues so far as manifested in the dominion of the spirit over the flesh."§ Wuttke: "As believing is taking up into our moral consciousness the ever present divine, so worshiping is elevating our moral consciousness to God."|| To which Köllner adds: "Unconditional confidence in God and the thankful recognition and acceptance of his mercies."¶ This definition precludes the very thought of intrusion from any outside claimant; it implies omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, infinitude in all things as belonging to the object of worship. And as the Roman Catholic includes in his Cultus the Trinity with all the saints, he means to render the elements of worship to all alike, no matter how rigorously he pleads for a distinction between superior and inferior reverence. Herbert in his beautiful poem, "To all the Saints and Angels," after acknowledging the tempting fascination of adoring them and paying loftiest tribute to the blessed Maid, breaks forth:

"But now, (alas) I dare not; for our King
Whom we do all joyntly adore and praise

*Exodus 20 : 5. †Deut. 6 : 13. ‡Examen Con. Tri., Pt. III, Sec. III.
§Wuttke: Ethics I, 369. ||Ibid II, 215. ¶Symbolik der Luth. Kirche.

Bids no such thing:
 And where His pleasure no injunction layes,
 ('Tis your own case) ye never move a wing.
 All worship is prerogative, and a flower
 Of his rich crown, from whom lyes no appeal
 At the last houre.
 Therefore we dare not from his garland steal
 To make a posie for inferiour power.*"

In this brief poetic offering there is concentrated the substance of divine teaching. Moses† cries out: "Thou, O Lord, art my refuge," to which St. Ambrose‡ answers: "Thou alone, O Lord art to be invoked." David§ rejoices to sing "The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon him," and St. Basil|| replies: "Prayer is directed not to man, but to God only." Asaph¶ hears God say: "I will deliver thee and thou shalt glorify me." St. Ephraim** rejoins: "To thee and none besides thee do I make my petition." To Isaiah†† God says: "I am the Lord; that is my name and my glory will I not give to another neither my praise to graven images." "And this knowledge," maintains Origen,‡‡ in his argument against Celsus, "will not permit us to pray with confidence to any other than the supreme God who is sufficient for all things, through our Saviour the Son of God." "We dare not worship those who are themselves worshipers."

But to this representation of our relation to the one supreme and all merciful Being, the advocate of invocation of the saints rejoins: "Just as in approaching a monarch we need the good will of his courtiers and intimate associates for permission to enter his presence so we need the heavenly beings around the King of Glory to carry our petitions into the sacred presence." "Whence have we," asks Spiel, "the great confidence in the intercession of the saints, but in the untold assurances that our prayers have been heard." So then our heavenly Father would not have heard them if it had not been for these intermediate influences by which they came to the ear of the Almighty!§§

*Prose and Verse, 75. †Ps. 91 : 9. ‡Jenkins, 195. §Ps. 145 : 18.

||In libello Maron. ¶Ps. 50 : 15. **Homilies. ††Is. 42 : 8.

‡‡Ante-Nicene Fathers, 4 : 544.

§§And yet Bellarmine shows that God makes known our wants to the saints, so they may pray for us.—*De Sanc. Beat.*, cap. XX, 735.

It will be remembered that heathen philosophy urged the same reason for the invocation of the Olympian gods*—that they should be Jupiter's courtiers and introduce his votaries. St. Ambrose in his exposition of the first chapter of Romans and St. Augustine in the eight chapter of the City of God antagonize this heathenism of saint-worship.† Besides, here is brought to light the weakness of this entire system of creature-worship which represents God as an unapproachable potentate whose clemency can be secured only through the recommendation of some favorite, and not of himself immediately. Have we not access to God through his son Jesus Christ and is not this the distinctive privilege of all Christians? The restoration of this gospel was the first work of the Lutheran theologians. How then will application to the saints appear to the saints themselves but an unpardonable derogation from the glory of Christ. And what will God himself think of such court trickery as that! Even an earthly monarch, who had appointed his own son as the sole means of access to himself and as the direct dispenser of his pardons and graces, would feel that recourse to the servants of his household or to any indirect method of approaching him would be a very grave affront.‡ Can we think less highly of God and his Son as our only revealed intercessor in whose name we are to bring our supplications and thanksgivings to the throne of grace? "This is the Christian religion that no one should be worshiped save the one God, because no one makes the soul blessed save the one God."—*Augustine*.§

But furthermore, rendering worship to beings inferior to the triune God opens the way for a *Christianized Polytheism*, the utter extinction of which God was seeking in all ages of the world. In a professedly monotheistic religion it supplies the polytheistic wants of the soul. Before people know the true God they long after gods; their souls reach out for a substantial answer to the consciousness of indestructibility. There is a twilight of immortality in every rational being. But what shall bring the perfect light of day? Before the sun of righteousness arises, the dimly glimmering stars of great heroes must answer.

*Hase: *Polemik*, 310.

†Chemnitz: *Ex. Conc. Trid. Pt. III., Sec. 4.*

‡Jenkins: *Romanism of Pius VI.*, 193.

§*Vera Religione*, cap. 55.

Something must fill up the vast distance between humanity and divinity. There is, therefore, a tendency in the human heart to create arbitrary objects of worship according to the lust or the fancy of the worshiper. The purest element of heathen theology is the deification of intellectual and moral attributes—manliness, purity, devotion, unstained truthfulness, courage, bravery, fortitude. Then it is easy enough to transfer these abstractions to concrete realities and personify one or the other in some separate human being. Hence the multiplication of the *Divi* among heathen peoples. In the paganizing periods of Christianity it was but natural to imitate the heathen custom. Melancthon explains that from heathen examples the multiplication of saints arose. Some building in Rome which had at first been erected by Agrippa to the avenging Jupiter and his satellites was afterwards rededicated by the Roman bishop to Mary and all the martyrs; the ancient Roman Pantheon became the modern Christian Pantheon; the saints were considered Christianized heroes and semi-deified human beings in precisely the old heathen style. In the *Libri Carolini* beatification is made identical with deification—canonizing “the faithful” the same thing as elevating the emperors to the position of *Theoi*.* Canonization is only another name for apotheosis. With only this difference: In the latter case it was the exaltation of the emperor to the gods, in the former the elevation included the humblest and poorest who had been washed in the blood of the Lamb and whose lives had been adorned by Christian virtues.†

Mantuanus observes that just as the Latins invoked Mars to aid in military enterprises; Castor and Pollux to take knight errantry under their patronage and Juno to be the protectress from fevers, so Saint Anna is a refuge in storms, Sabastian from pestilence, Florian from fire; Saints George and Martin are the tutelaries of the Germans; Saints Paul and Peter of the Romans. As the custom of calling upon the patron saint grows in practice the worship of Jesus falls into the back-ground if not entire neglect. And that this assertion is not a perversion of the facts is plain enough from the numerous instances of which the following are examples. A Tyrolese mountaineer placed

*Neander.

†Hase: Polemik, 310.

this inscription over the door of his house: "Holy Florian defend this house from fire." And a citizen of Vienna painted on the gable of his dwelling: "This house stood formerly in the hand of God; he allowed it to burn away; now it is committed to St. Florian's care." If these examples seem somewhat ordinary and ludicrous, as Hase facetiously intimates, then the fact that Francis of Assisi praised the legend: "My saint hears whom *God does not*," borders on the sacrilegious. Yet this is the inevitable consequence of placing a creature before the Creator. Pure monotheism cuts the roots of all polytheizing tendencies. Is there any unfairness in thus stating the case? Suppose that on some morning when all the worshipers had left the cathedral a monotheist from some other sphere should quietly enter it, pick up the prayer book and see the *ora pro nobis* to scores of beings with human names, should see in the pictures which adorn the walls the figure of a crowned woman with a child in her arms and prostrate penitents about her, should examine the marble statues on all sides with evidences of superhuman reverence being paid them, what would be his reflections? The pagans and Manicheans reproached the saint-worshippers centuries ago for deifying human beings. Until the 9th century the churches had only one altar. But the learned papal bishop Nicolas of Cusa accused the Italians of substituting saints for the old Latin gods.

Possibly the Arian controversy is indirectly responsible, in part at least, for this polytheizing tendency in worship. The divine of the Saviour's personality was exalted at the expense of the human. The idea of the *God-man* was too much lost sight of in the attempted identification of his nature with the unseen and incomprehensible Deity. Hence Christ became the object of a remoter, a more awful adoration. Says Milman: * "The mind began to seek out, or eagerly to seize some other more material beings in closer alliance with human sympathies. The constant propensity of man to humanize his deity, readily clung with its devotion to humbler objects. The weak wing of the common mind could not soar to the unapproachable light in

*History of Christianity, Book IV, 425.

which Christ dwelt with the Father: it dropped to the earth and bowed itself down before some less mysterious and less infinite object of veneration." What then? Is the weakness of faith in the only true God and the slovenliness of materializing propensities an excuse for turning away from the Supreme Ruler and fixing the heart's devotions upon the works of his hands? They who would remain faithful to the ancient creed of the Christian Church in every age dare not divide their worship between the Creator and the creature. Says Dante:* "Invoking the saints is false worship. In Christ alone is our salvation." "And when thou prayest thou shalt say: Our Father who art in heaven." "The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon him."†

3. *If they divide their worship they become guilty of idolatry.* To this conclusion we are reluctantly but inevitably driven by a scriptural, rational and practical study of this subject. It is noteworthy to remark that the Confessors in the true spirit of conciliation at first hesitated to press the charge of idolatry against Rome, but in the later symbols, the growing superstition is severely handled. The Apology in discussing the belief in special saints as the patrons of certain civil employments and avocations calls it a "shameful heathen lie"‡ and in the Smalcald Articles the entire practice of invoking the saints is declared to be "idolatry."§ Much stronger language is used at other places but nothing in the Lutheran symbols can compare with the expressions employed in the Helvetic and Gallic Confessions. Indeed, Calvinism allows hagiolatry no ground of justification whatever and calls it a deception of the devil.|| Neander states that here is to be found one of the causes of the rise of Mohammedanism—the original adherents considering Mariolatry equivalent to idolatry.

In view of such facts and others, numerous attempts have been made by Rome to modify and explain the nature of this fundamental element of its system. The explicit statements of God's word, forbidding even the faintest and apparently inno-

*Neander. †Ps. 145 : 18. ‡Mueller, Sym. Bücher, 229. §Ibid, 305.

||Gall. Conf., Art. 24. See also Zöckler, 172; Hase, 307 and Guericke, 239.

cent manifestations of a depreciated worship of God; the positive denunciations by the apostolic and early church fathers against polytheistic tendencies in prayer; the rigorous opposition on the part of pious and influential Catholics against the introduction of intermediate objects of veneration and the disastrous practical consequences, all have had more or less influence with Rome in vindicating the "invocation of the saints." Indeed it has become necessary for the clergy to apologize for it and extenuate its results rather than set up a practical defense. This is especially true in regard to the charge of idolatry.

Conscious of the justice and seriousness of this imputation the Roman Curia has given the name of *relative* or *indirect* worship to this cultus, a worship which will begin with inferior but ultimately terminate in God as the final object of adoration. It draws the subtle distinction between the worship of God and that of the saints by pointing out the infinite interval between the saints and the King of the saints. Bellarmine* receives the credit of amplifying and officially formulating the differences which Augustine is believed to have originated in his rules on "reverencing the martyrs." Three degrees of worship are specified: first, *doulia* that which is an inferior kind of worship and due to the saints and angels; it is more than human and less than divine; secondly, *hyperdoulia*—a word of comparative recent coinage to describe the nature of the veneration to be shown to the Virgin Mary, a form of worship loftier than the *doulia*; and thirdly, *latria* which signifies supreme worship and is applicable to God alone. Augustine calls the first of these forms *civil worship*—*cultum civilem sue cultum charitatis ac societatis* and the latter he calls *religious worship*, *cultum religionis*, and maintains that all forms are *per maiorem gloriam Dei*.†

But there is not sufficient clearness and force in these theoretical distinctions,—the ordinary mind will not grasp them. Besides, the Scriptures defend only one kind of worship; the words adoration and invocation are used interchangeably in reference to the same object; invoking and adoring are applicable in a like

*Guericke: Christliche Symbolik, 243.

†For the most lucid elaboration of this matter to be found anywhere see Carpov: Isagoge in libros symbolicos, 539.

sense; there is nowhere any divine authority to teach adoration of God and invocation of saints as an evidence that the higher reverence is accorded to the former. Says Hopkins in his exposition of the first commandment: "Withhold the worship from the saints and all other honors rendered them will speedily fall away." This succinct, but axiomatic truth settles the whole question of graduated steps in devotion between the creature and the Creator. But the design of keeping up these distinctions is to show that in worshiping the saints God is worshiped supremely and the saints inferiorly. This removes the objection of idolatry, it is thought. But the same process of reasoning would prove that the heathen who adored Jupiter as the one supreme—the father of all—yet invoked "lords many and gods many" of minor and inferior greatness, were not idolaters. Yet the Bible expressly condemns as idolatrous all the ancient polytheisms which acknowledged a subordination in the sphere of deity and yet placed over all the minor and secondary divinities, one supreme God—the creator of all things.* It broadly and practically argues that such divinities are gods and to worship them was to render divine homage. Dr. Hodge† argues very conclusively that any homage, internal or external, which involves the ascription of divine attributes to its object, if that object be a creature, is idolatrous. And thus the homage paid by Catholics to the Virgin and the saintly host is a question of fact and not of theory. Pusey‡ relates that a friend of his was asked to offer a prayer to the Virgin Mary in exactly the same language which we address to the Holy Trinity. The reader of Roman Catholic literature will be astonished to find so many illustrations confirmatory of this. Yet Cardinal Newman§ insists that idolatry is: "regarding and worshiping a being as one and the supreme God, which *is* not; but any other worship is not idolatry even though we regard a saint as a secondary divinity 'all but' the one and supreme God." We can only ask the de-

*See this idea admirably discussed by Mozley: *Theory of Development*, 67.

†Systematic Theology, III, 281.

‡Eirenicon, 106.

§Development of Doctrine.

vout and learned defender of "Mary and all the saints," what then shall we make of the fact that there has been in all ages an idolatry which has not answered his definition, though Scripture, history, reason and common sense have all so designated it from the creation of the world? It is much easier to construct theories *from* the teachings of history than to fit the teachings of history *into* theories evolved from one's own consciousness.

And here the burden of the argument may rest. Let it be admitted that theoretical distinctions can be preserved in the canons of œcumenical councils and papal decrees; are they practical? Even if we were compelled to admit the reasons Romanists urge as sufficient to establish distinctions of worship, history shows that practically the passing from invocation to adoration is speedy and easy and hagiolatry soon becomes idolatry;* and the proof is abundant that countless Catholics in all circumstances of life apply much quicker to the Virgin and the saints than to the Father and the Son. And why not? It is so attractive to human nature. Besides, what worshiper can keep in mind the varieties of prayer demanded by the three-fold form of devotion? As soon as he approaches the object of his devotions intellectual distinctions must absolutely vanish. You may convey to the ear the separate idea of *latria*, *doulia* and *hyperdoulia* but you can not convey it to the heart of the worshiper. What answer would the devout Romanist of Italy or Spain or even France give to your question as to how he distributed his worship this morning between his patron saint, the Virgin Mary and the Deity? His very ignorance and simplicity would be the strongest argument against the hair-splitting discriminations in worship. At least the common people are unable to reconcile the *de fide* teachings of the church and the pious opinions obtained from popular instruction.†

Yet the saint-worshiper strenuously contends that the homage he pays to angels and the spirits of the departed is an indirect exaltation of God and promotion of the glory of Christ; these created beings are the reflection of divine majesty, the halo around the brow of Divinity and when he beholds them by faith

*Zückler, 170.

†Pusey: Eirenicon, 12.

he stands in awe before the Deity himself, in adoring the heavenly host he accords the ultimate thoughts of his devotion to Him alone. We may answer him after the sublime manner of Arnobius* in his masterly defence of Christianity against the heathenism of the third and fourth centuries: If you can not prove irrefutably that these saints (gods) are what you represent them to be, why do you ask us to worship them? we want to know whom we worship. If they are what you tell us of them why do you not prove it to us from the eternal principles of reason and common sense? And if that is true which you affirm of them, namely that they have sprung from the Supreme Being and are a part of him, why do you ask of us the idle task of approaching one or each of them personally, since it is His good pleasure that we should take hold of the divine himself? "The supreme Deity suffices us—the Creator and Lord of the universe, who orders and rules all things; in whom we serve all that requires our service; in him we worship all that should be adored, and venerate all that demands the homage of our reverence." Even long before (A. D. 110) Tatian† had said: "Man is to be honored as a fellow man; but God alone is to be revered." Here are the seeds of Athanasius' adamant argument which assails the idea of inferior worship in the Church of Rome with as crushing a force as it did the Arians when he convicted them of idolatry in the worship of Christ as a creature: "Ye have two gods—the uncreated and a created—one begotten and the other unbegotten."

Finally, saint-worship is *dangerous* because it is destructive of *sound morality*. The logical sequence of the argumentation of our Confession points out this practical result. Not to say, that the practice it condemns, endangers our salvation—that is a foregone conclusion—but that it undermines and eventually destroys the principles called for by a pure code of morals. This is not a question of speculative theology or metaphysics, but of history, which must decide in how far the morality of a people suffers from the intermingling of the names of the departed in their devotions. Dr. Newman by *a priori* reasoning

*Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VI, 464.

†Ibid, II, 66. *Contra Arian.*

seeks to prove that the carnal mind will not be led to the worship of God if the worship of saints is forbidden. But St. Paul* is against him. Admit co-ordinate divinities and the same consequences will follow in professedly Christian devotion which followed the forsaking of the Supreme Being in Gentile worship. Only the indwelling of God in the soul can arrest the downward tendency induced by original sin. The object of faith and veneration must be both almighty and immaculate. This is the dictum of universal experience and not the dictum of a system. And probably the least objectionable feature is that the invocation of the saints inspires and encourages the tendency toward a mere *sensuous worship*, which, if it does not belittle the faculties of the soul, does not quicken and ennoble them.

Gibbons† admits that a heart tenderly attached to the saints will give vent to its feelings in the language of hyperbole, just as an enthusiastic lover will call his future bride his adorable queen without any intention of worshipping her as a goddess. But can such a sentimentalism be acceptable to Christ? It borders on the offensive, and the learned Cardinal knows full well that even the worship of Mary has often nothing exalting in it. Some of the invocations addressed to her are shocking in their suggestiveness.‡ It seems almost irreverent to detract in any way from the honor of the mother of our Lord, but if she be conscious of some of the silly contemplations which have been written about her in the name of religion the spotless purity of her noble womanhood must revolt with indignation.

Saints usurp the place of Christ in the soul; they are so much easier of access, so much easier to conciliate, so much more tolerant of human weakness, so much more ready to make allowance for broken law. Thus not only are the elements of divine worship obliterated but the personal efforts at holiness neglected by those who expect their patron saints to accomplish for them the needed restoration. As in the days of Deborah§ "the highways are unoccupied, and the travelers walk through the by-ways." It is the demand of true Christianity to walk in the footsteps of Jesus, but there are not a few people of doubtful

*Rom. 1 : 23, 24.

†Faith of our Fathers, 182.

‡Edgar's Variations of Popery, 547.

§Judges 5 : 6.

morality who, rather than do this *one* duty, will undertake to do more than their duty. True, the devout Romanist will ask whether saint-worshippers are not better church-goers than their opponents; whether art has not received the impetus of its wonderful development from the opportunities offered to sculpture and painting by the cultus he defends; whether the rich variety in the history of the saints, as for instance the innocent sweetness of St. Agnes, the captivating beauty of a Magdalene, the holy earnestness of the dying Jerome, have not had a most potent influence upon the mind and heart of human society; whether the countless instances of ecclesiastical monuments erected in memory of a mother, a child, a brother, a friend have not dotted many lands with the grandest churches, chapels and monasteries? Would the worship of the saints then weaken devotion to the Saviour? Would the honors paid to the mother of Christ detract from the reverence due her Son? Protestants will admit the premise, but the conclusion does not follow. Suppose saint-worship does contain much that is beautiful and has given a powerful impulse to the plastic arts: the gods and goddesses of Greece were thought to be far more beautiful and found far more beautiful exemplification in art, nevertheless her religion was stamped from the beginning with the sure marks of mutability, corruption and decay.

Aside from the express teaching of God's word—by the admonition to worship God alone and by the prohibition not to divide allegiance—the question must be decided by the testimony of fact, not conjecture or presumption. We may assert in all charitableness to Catholic Christians that the ravages of unbelief and corrupt morality are greatest where adoration of the saints is made most prominent. One most notable phase was already remarkable in and prior to the days of the reformers. It was a vast channel for the enrichment of the Church. The popes turned the sale of the works of the saints, their bones and other relics into a most lucrative trade: Wickliffe had said: "Avarice lies at the root of the practice," and Luther with his idiomatic vigor replied: "The pope* has reaped an immense rev-

*De Missa: Mueller, 305.

enue from the traffic; when once no more aid can be gained from them, they will soon be allowed to rest." It is notorious to-day that Rome makes as good a merchandise out of the relics of Christian martyrs as do the Egyptians out of the mummies of heathen Pharaohs and Potiphars.* "If thou wilt help me to the realization of my ambition, I will canonize thee," said Pope Benedict XIV. to an object of his veneration.†

This is not an accidental or necessary outgrowth of the practice in a particular age or country. History, past and present, marshalls its evidence. In the Abyssinian or Ethiopian Church where the worship of the saints was the most conspicuous element of Christianity, the immorality was notorious and shocking in the extreme.‡ Claus Harms§ in replying to the question whether the final abolition of this practice from the German churches had enhanced the moral status of the people unhesitatingly asserts that especially two virtues of the Christian faith, industry and chastity, had largely increased. Dr. Greenwald|| gives an alarming picture of the country where this fundamental element of Roman Catholicism has untrammelled sway. Dr. Pusey¶ says "it is notorious that this system is the great barrier to Christian union and the ground of alienation of pious minds in England." The piety of the Church of England can not affiliate with the state of morality in English Romanism! What a commentary on the lugubrious lamentations of Faber: "Here in England Mary is not half enough preached; hence it is that *Jesus is not loved*,** that heretics are not converted, that the Church is not exalted; that souls which might be saints, wither and dwindle. *Thousands of souls perish because Mary is withheld from them.*"†† And all this because of the sensitiveness of the nation in regard to the honor and glory of JESUS. What is the significance of a comparison between South America, Mexico, or even Spain and Italy, where the worship of the saints has unhindered play, with England and Germany and the United States, where it is checked by what Faber calls "the sneers of of heresy."

*Miracles and Saints, 93. †Hase: Polemik, 301. ‡Herzog: I: 48.

§Augs. Conf., 218. ||Luth. Ch. Rev., V, 11. ¶Eirenicon, 108.

**The italics are Faber's.

††Ibid, 115.

It has been intimated in high circles and on *ex cathedra* assurance that the definition of the *Cultus Sanctorum* was as necessary in the sixteenth century as was that of the *Homoousion* in the fourth; but this examination of Article XXI of the Augsburg Confession shows that there is no similarity between a *truth* which had from the first been believed by all except acknowledged heretics, and a *practice* which was not observed by the successors of the apostles, had no definite and uniform advocacy among the Church Fathers; was always arraigned by some of the most spiritual men of the Church; had persistent opponents at the Council of Constance, was assailed in the Ante-Tridentine theology, repudiated and condemned by many of the representative men of the Romish Communion; and, above all, is contrary to the word of God, derogatory to the glory of the Redeemer, repugnant to the spiritual worship of God, pervaded with the evils of polytheism and idolatry, and has no foundation in reason and morality.

Indeed the cardinal doctrine so bravely defended by the Confessors finds a vivid illustration in a saying prevalent among the country people of Suabia, that immediately before death each Catholic must become Protestant—*Evangelisch*; after extreme unction the priest discloses to the dying the need of an implicit trust in Jesus because all hope in the saints is a delusion. And this accords with the dying testimony of Augustine,* who suddenly broke forth in his last moments, as if a revelation had come to him from another world: "Now at last I have learned that the heavenly Father hears the prayers of his believing children." And that is the real "Communion of saints," when all believers in the Triune God join with the angels and the saints in worshiping him in spirit and truth, who rules in heaven and on earth—our Creator, Preserver and Redeemer.

**Apologia*: Mueller, 229.

ARTICLE II.

INFANT BAPTISM THE BASIS OF CHRISTIAN NURTURE.

By REV. LEE M. HEILMAN, A. M., Chicago, Illinois.

The work of spiritual nurture must start with a first principle. Education and culture in every sphere begin with and elaborate a present embryo existence. The injunctions "to train" and "bring up" necessarily imply something as yet undeveloped but which is the specific subject of nurture. St. Paul enjoined on Timothy not to neglect even the ministerial gift he had just freshly received by the laying on of hands.

This idea of developing a germinal life seems to be far from prevalent in the present care of the young. There are eminent failures at training in the cases of thousands of the Church's children in our cities and larger towns. Explanations are offered in the hindrance arising from necessary toil and cares of the middling classes; every resource is drawn on to avert the evil impending over the pupils of our public and religious schools; genius has elaborated aids for teaching and makes the modern press groan under tons of juvenile literature, until the so-called Christian and Bible training stands side by side with the cause of missions as a feature of the century, and methods and study—evangelism, city missions and lay work are enlisted to supplement what seems to have been neglected or failed in, but these are very frequently attended by only a hollow echo and absence of genuine fruit. The science of religious education seems to advocate a struggle after varieties—ways and men and efforts not yet worn threadbare in "gospel hardening." But is there not a central germinal basis from which all operations must proceed? In the classic and casual literature on this subject, and therefore probably too in the pulpit and among various workers, there is seldom an allusion to the essential method of developing a primary principle. The truth is that the army of teachers particularly is left to a routine of mental instruction and a general beating of the air; and this is so because the divine

plan of training from childhood and infancy a certain primordial life is lost sight of through rational skepticism and so has fallen into disrepute and disuse. The Scriptures point to a definite training in a certain way of righteousness by nurture of a life which grows in the Lord.

But all are born with a principle of evil which no method of culture can transform into a holy principle. This innate vice if unchecked will naturally grow into proportions of a dominant character, and hence we are forced to the alternative of seeking for another, opposite force, which is the seed to be matured into the life desired.

This process of vital development is taught in the "law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus." Christianity is such a development. The Divine Kingdom is an organic life with consecutive relations of growth. The centre and source of this life is the incarnation of the Son of God in humanity, thence first in the individual soul and next in the body of believers—the Church, of which he is also the head. This union with Christ is the life to be nurtured, and must be implanted as the comprehensive seed containing fundamentally all that constitutes the mature life of the individual as a living member of the organic mystic body. To this germ or plant specifically all true methods of education closely adhere.

There is also a point of time and place at which this beginning is effected. The ordinance of baptism is a divinely appointed rite for admitting persons into the union of the Church—the body of Christ. During all the divine dispensations on earth there has been an ordinance for the young prior to their apprehension of its meaning—a sacrament before they could receive the means of the Word. The nurture proceeded from and with that beginning. There is not a hint in Scripture that training had any place where this starting-point was not first effected. There was some essential element there that was not to be omitted and in the future training not to be ignored.

We find then in the ordinance of baptism applied to the child an efficacy that would prophesy its value in that soul's future rearing.

In this ordinance are more than forms and symbols. The Scriptures promise with it *saving* benefits. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Hence baptism is also connected with *forgiveness of sins*—"Repent and be baptized * * * for the remission of sins," and where that is there must also be the reconciled state of justification. But this saving and pardoning good includes then necessarily a certain form or degree of *regeneration*, and hence too the presence and operation of the Holy Ghost. This renewing power therefore we find declared in the words, "Born of water and of the Spirit," "According to his mercy he saves us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." So that with the proper use of the water connected with the word is also the Spirit as the efficient divine agent to produce the blessed result of the renewal. St. Peter also promised the Spirit in the ordinance connected with the word or doctrine of Christ's name and his offer of pardon when he said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the *gift of the Holy Ghost*." In this broad sense then baptism is called the "bath" or "laver of regeneration." Through this sacrament the union of Christ with the soul is effected ordinarily, and so union with the body of Christ, for "by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." Our Lord was himself baptized so that he might bring his people with and by himself into the covenant union. "For as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Hence to be "baptized into his death" is to become partakers of his death and thereby also of his resurrection and so ingrafted into his life.

And all these effects are promised to the smallest child. The old covenant which has never been and never will be annulled in its embracing infants has in its nature more than an external form. Circumcision whose complete office was exhibited in adults, was connected with spiritual circumcision or change of heart, and with the child therefore could exist essentially only under the same general conditions. The infant was meant to be in no less blessed relation to God and his Church than the

man. The promise in its fulness was and is to the children. Christ said that his kingdom of grace was composed of infants and those whose life and spirit had attained to their infant docility, trust and guileless sincerity. When he therefore blessed them it was not an unmeaning form or merely a solemn and symbolic act, signifying what then had no existence in fact and possibly through the temptations in the path to youth never would exist. The divine acts were not of an empty significance and much less the sacred ordinances which were to be administered to all nations and for all time—"until He come." A promise of favor in baptism is a guarantee of the offer of spiritual and inner blessing. The Scriptures declare that the ordained form is a "*seal*" as well as a "*sign*," but then there must be something to seal. It is a "*pledge*" of the present fulfilment of the visible sign, for the pledge is the promise of immediate acceptance into divine favor and is furthermore an initiation into a vital relation with the kingdom of God, which state is "*sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise*," necessarily and effectively there present. And the Spirit in his saving and regenerating presence has no office if it be not of the inward motion on the heart. The consequent spiritual grace is therefore offered, and being unresisted effects its end with the child. The possibility of such influences is put beyond question when it is learned how John the Baptist was endowed with the Holy Ghost from the womb; and the natural child Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost and preserved in the Spirit in his entire nature from the conception on, partly so as to show that infant-nature has capacity for such endowment, and also that through him other children might enjoy the divine possession. And though he himself from infancy was in the divine kingdom in immaculate purity, he was yet finally also baptized and so opened a new channel by baptism to bring children and others into the mystical union of that kingdom.

The presumption too of reason and our feelings is that the young nature just entering on a life of many snares would be put in possession of some power to be developed over against and instead of what otherwise would be produced by the natural power of evil. Where sin abounds grace doth much more

abound. A sacrament implants its life before the word can be apprehended, so that the root of the spiritual life beginning coordinately with the propensity to sin, may prevent sin while its dire results and the remedy against it in the word are not yet comprehended. So then the baptized child when it comes to the age of conscious accountability has a field first sown with wheat—a vantage ground over him who would sow all in tares. Grace thus in the Christian child abounds more than sin. One cannot well conceive that the loving Father, with his promise of a family covenant with his people, would leave the most helpless to beat against the storm without the essential and only safeguard. This is the only theory that is in harmony with the constant scripture provision for the children, and with the precious invitation of the eternal Son to have them come to him on the ground that they are of the heavenly kingdom and are privileged to enter where he both from infancy and by baptism before them entered. This lends special significance to the command, "Feed my lambs." They have a real spiritual nature akin to the sheep—believing adults. They are not goats to be converted into lambs.

These children, who through their relation to the Church by birth and by the initiative rite have always stood in a different relation to God from those outside of these conditions, are to be reared in a peculiar nurture.

In the fact therefore of such a spiritual child-life our own Scriptural Church is abundantly versed; and the standards of most of the other denominations are remarkably emphatic on the benefits of infant baptism. Dr. C. Hodge in his great work says on baptism, "What is to hinder the imputation to them [infants] of the righteousness of Christ, or receiving the renewing of the Holy Ghost so that their whole nature may be developed into a state of reconciliation with God? Doubtless this often occurs." Watson, too, the great Methodist theologian, says, "Baptism secures the Holy Ghost in those secret spiritual influences by which actual regeneration of those children who die in infancy, is effected, and which is the seed of life in those who are spared."

If baptism has no spiritual benefit for the infant, then all Pro-

testantism must change its definitions of a sacrament or else renounce infant baptism. Even the most pronounced low-churchmen of our communion who have given study and their pen to the subject have had to surprise themselves and others with some such conclusions.

It may seem however that the benefits of infant baptism are not of a sufficiently tangible nature to admit of recognition in education. It would be sufficient reply to say that the promises of grace are such as to demand of our faith and prayers the expectation of at least some divine result in the advancing years, but there is more than speculative efficacy in baptismal grace. Where the renewal of the Holy Ghost is, there are also the *elements* of the new life. The Spirit received here, as always, bears fruits of quickening and illumination. Hence susceptibilities are there which make the earliest dawn of reason more open to hear and assent to the truth. The spiritual nature is awakened to those tender degrees of pliability that make the slightest touches of good influence felt ere even speech is understood. Herein therefore lie the definite and more complete tangible factors of a regenerate nature, namely, repentance and faith. Faith, the indispensable element in any truly gracious effects, is here necessarily present. The sacrament in itself is a "seal of the righteousness of faith," and similar to the Lord's Supper is a "sacrament of repentance and faith." One of the blessed fruits of the Spirit therein is declared to be "faith."

Faith in its profoundest sense does not consist in knowledge, for even groanings by the spirit which cannot be uttered and hence also cannot be understood distinctly, even in adults make effectual intercession with God. There are unfathomable longings of nature that are acceptable at the throne. Hence are not the tender leanings of a child upon the arm and upon the guiding of a parent really faith? The earliest promptings to look up to, to obey and to put confidence in a mother are trust—not the trust of broad intelligence, but the best the child is capable of—the offering "according to that he hath," which is the measure of the divine requirement, and this is a tangible effect. And may it not be that this trust of the baptized child implies the influences that come within the range of the sacred promises,

and is not merely a natural motion? The sacramental virtue begins co-ordinately with the power to sin and so may early pervade the young nature and character. Timothy's faith mentioned as connected with that of his mother and grandmother, must have begun in the earliest susceptibilities, from the time the mother's own faith influenced the child and ere it was guided by its independent knowledge. But he also grew up in this faith for it is expressly recorded that he would be "nourished up in the words of faith whereunto he had attained"—that is, would be additionally nourished in what he had already received while yet in his mother's arms. His original faith would so be perpetuated into the tree and fruits of even his ministerial piety and other general qualifications. Similarly the wide-spreading life of faith and holiness in Samuel from the circumcision at the temple, of John the Baptist from the mother's womb, and even of the blessed Lord himself—it all had *grown* in the divine favor; and so since their mature life was a growth it follows that the faith and its accompaniments all existed in the germ principle from which this later and elaborate faith and life were developed. Hence too the earliest and controlling motives in them were gracious and not natural. The Spirit produces a fruit of faith which has all the concomitant affections of "gentleness," "temperate" restraints and "goodness" in deeds. We therefore have reason to believe that a boy is disposed to be obedient, truthful and to grow up in a proper Christian life because the baptismal blessing sanctifies his thoughts and desires. These gracious results began moreover, in the earlier ground-work—the rudiments of faith and repentance.

The requirement to apprehend and *know* of the truth and of the ordinance, before faith and its life can be said to exist, is to bring faith to the lower realms of reason where it does not belong. It is precisely what gnosticism demanded—to *know* consciously. Roman Catholicism too requires that some one have faith in the *sacraments themselves* and hence has to *know* of them; and so the efficacy of baptism depends on the conscious *intention* of the administering priest. Faith is above such carnal mixture of rationalism. Therefore Jesus speaks so distinctly of

the faith the "little ones" have and have in him—"who believe on me."

There is here then abundant of that which is tangible and may be trained. This faith and its associated tenderness of penitence are the very substance of the Christian life—the elements which are to be deepened in the youthful character. The fact that baptism is administered but once and has thenceforth a constant virtue, argues that there is more than simply the Spirit's presence, there is a product of the Spirit—an implanted life. The office indeed of the Spirit is to impart Christ, for in baptism Christ "is put on"—who is the life of faith and holiness—"the righteousness and sanctification." Here is the vital departure of Romanism which holds that baptism *ex opere operato*—through the administration of the ordinance as an objective reality produces the saving effects: Protestantism says that it is the word and Spirit which impart Christ in a vital union. Faith does not effect this as a conscious factor—a faith in which itself one must in turn have faith, but the blessing lies in the union with Christ and *effects* faith which is the gift of God—a gift bestowed through the ordained means. Faith in itself is not a means—it is a product, but always an essential adjunct of every gracious work—an element of the effect. This gift of Christ himself in the union of faith is an implanted objective fact then not a magic effect, and not merely an attendant influence of the Spirit, but a work of the Spirit, and constantly sustained by it. This means then that here is a substantial reality—a life that may be taken hold of and developed into mature character.

Since then such effects are produced, is their peculiar divine power to be wasted? Even the slightest susceptibilities would hardly be bestowed of God without intentional permanence and for constant future good. The Scriptures indicate emphatically that the effects of the infant rite are to continue. The ancient prophets and leaders made their ringing appeals to the people on the basis of the people having received the sacrament of circumcision, and the Jews habitually boasted of their being "of the circumcision" as against the uncircumcised Gentiles. Jeremiah recalled to their minds this rite to stir them to improve what was signified in the early sign and seal, urging them, "Cir-

cumcise yourselves to the Lord and take away the foreskin of your heart." Accordingly also St. Paul with a view to encouragement to hope in the promises reminds the Galatians how by their baptism into Christ they had put on Christ. The seed of life is planted early in the child's nature so that it might grow continuously and consecutively into the stalk and fruit over against the otherwise constant growth of innate sin. And when once the young are grown to adult members, they through the early influences and effects of their baptism continuing daily, become a purified and purifying Church, for it is declared that "Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it that he might *sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.*" That word is not only connected with the water at the administration of the rite, but its meaning and promises are also recalled during the child's development, and so this "visible word" as this sacrament is termed, becomes a life-long means of grace—in far off years purifying and cleansing the Church.

The Romish Church, apprehending the true design of a sacrament, saw the necessity of one for those fallen from the virtue of baptism, and accordingly invented that of penance; and some before that time delayed baptism until near death to avoid falling from the pardon of sins which it offered; but these are misapprehensions concerning the permanent virtue of this ordinance. This is not repeated as the other means of grace are, because it provides a germ which contains the life-force of the entire Christian tree. This divinely implanted seed is meant to effect nothing less than the truest perfection of the soul and hence plays a vital part in that soul's after training.

Since then we have such a starting point of Christian life and development in the young of the Church we must measure the extent and meaning of the trust committed to us.

It certainly claims endeavors and means that will effect its enlargement. It is in the child as yet not a perfect life of faith. It has in the beginning but germinal potencies, which are waiting to be perfected as soon as the conscious personal side of the subject enters with its knowledge. This state where the implanting is but once, if left uncultivated, may lie dormant for years just as a seed does, but it is not character in this neglected

form and hence at the period of responsibility is not of saving benefit, for then the Lord wants matured tree and fruit. There is thus peril in carelessly possessing such a grace. This mighty virtue in potential forms is administered once and only once—it is not of the nature of nourishment, to be repeated as the word and eucharist need be, but it is wholly imbedded at the first planting and hence the future character and welfare are dependent upon developing it. A trust of so substantial a possibility has a claim on the Church to whose bosom it is committed—it is a heavenly talent which dare not be wrapped up in a napkin. Here is a living force which promises to spread through the entire spirit and career of the child's future, and in the spiritual rearing of that child this force cannot be overlooked. Since also by the union with Jesus that soul is in the Church and a living member of that mystical organism, it is to be developed in and with the growth of all the parts and is designed to enter intimately into the one pervading life of the comprehensive body. If then it cease to grow into the full stature it mars the structure and becomes disease in it. It has vital union and must not be unnourished or bruised. The baptized infant is brought into the organic life for protection just as the body sustains its members. To this nurture consequently home and church, parent and ministry have a mutual relation. The parent is the instrument to whom the first longings of faith cling and where all the original Christian motions find activity, and that parent is placed in the position to support this tendril. He is the agent of the covenant in the beginning, through his own faith, and for a time is the priest through whom the word and the daily renewal of the seal of baptism is administered to the developing child. But besides the parent, the Church through the parents' union with it and through the officiating ministry as also agent to the covenant arrangement, is bound by the same solemn ties to provide for this growth and especially in due time to provide the word and the bread of the Holy Supper. These relations in themselves argue that the spiritual life at first so imperfect and yet so infinitely promising, justly claims from them endeavors of training,—indeed it is for this, these offices and relations

of family and church exist. The sacred trust committed to Christians and to the Church is a talent which is faithfully kept only when reared in the nurture for which it is so early given.

And further it is to be remarked that this gift in infant baptism is the only object capable of Christian nurture. No more than the substance and fundamental elements of Christian life given in that ordinance can be expected. What substitute is there for these heavenly mysteries, or what other basis in a child is there to be touched, on which to construct a Christian character? The aesthetic nature or the utilitarian faculties may be cultivated, but neither can produce the spiritual life demanded in the divine kingdom. Philosophy admits the fact of the spiritual nature in man but that nature is fallen and cannot evolve holy character. Such a result must begin with the centre of such development—that is, the incarnate Son of God in union with the soul. Training means the rearing of a particular plant or life towards maturity, and so we have one definite grace of the child furnished for spiritual growth. The Christian home and school and church have not a secular, mental or social faculty to educate first and by and by the religious. There is but one true life and to that all else must be subsidiary and nothing co-ordinate with it. The two spheres trained separately jar and end in confusion and doubt, and it is impossible that the earliest secular culture will find the youth in a more mature period naturally turning to spiritual concerns. That “natural” tendency is the contrary of this, and, if educated alone, overrides the spiritual life.

There is left then but the single alternative of submitting the child to the sign and seal of the covenant of promise so that it may be reared in the grace divinely offered. There is but one door, and that is Christ, and he is there by the Spirit in the ordinance—the incarnate Saviour, the beginning and source of all true life. Outside of this the child is without the means of the union with Christ. Who can expect to bring it to the earliest development of a full regenerate character—bearing the fruits of the Spirit, when the appointed medium of the Spirit is neglected or refused? From the beginning of the Church the covenant with the children was sealed with a sacrament before the means

of the word was possible. When the young fall away from holy living, legitimate efforts to reclaim them are made more hopeful and aided by the prevenient susceptibilities of faith and repentance as substantially imparted in baptism, for the backsliders are still in the covenant and under its obligations and its promises.

From these two propositions, then, that baptismal grace claims endeavors in the way of training and that this is the only object capable of training, we infer how derelict in the genuine work of saving the young of the Church is the effort that aims principally at conversion. It keeps digging up the soil and essays to plant the seed which it still but disturbs, while that same effort ought to be nurturing the gracious life already present. It sets aside all the early covenant and spiritual relations as unnecessary or unreal. These growing hearts that are supposed to be taught and reared in the covenant sympathies and influences of pious homes and the sanctuary, are thus rather to be regarded as outside the divine promises and practically heathen. They cannot take comfort from the promise that they are saved since being baptized they also now believe. They must rather doubt that they are children of God until they have found evidences of regeneration in the domain of self-conscious reason. This ignoring the virtue of grace in the sacrament is a subversion of the entire scheme of means in redemption, and tends so to discard even the divine word. The legitimate fruit of this course has been in the wild song and shout and confusion of prayer as substitutes for the instruction of the holy word. Professing to be guided by reason rather than by "forms and symbols" men have contradicted themselves even here and have dispensed with that reason which they profess to exalt; and so by seeking conversion in the feelings without means and often in an immediate gift and witness of the Spirit, as they imagine, they accept a belief in results without means unless it be the means of evolving spiritual life by the magic of extraordinary human effort, all which is much more difficult to believe than that God will own his appointments; and their course practically rejects both intelligent reason and the divine ordinances. Where then is the consistency in observing any of the sacraments, and especially

infant baptism if so be that its effects are not to be cherished and extended? But that is not all. When the beautiful faith of a child is set back as not the faith of conversion, it is dissuaded from enjoying the love of Christ which it has, and thus gets a distrust, which tends ever after to produce doubt in its divine acceptance. The heart is wounded by being crushed away from the consolation of the promises, and unhealed wanders in the dark and fatal forests of fear. The tender plant of faith and hope and love is retarded in the growth and for years may not be able to recover the loss, if ever here it can. Woe is pronounced against those who offend the little ones that believe on Jesus.

There is supreme wisdom in concentrating the continued efforts and agencies of a life-time upon the development of this one talent of the Spirit. Character building is not the work of a spasmodic effort. It is an objective growth. This one original principle faithfully nurtured effects commonly the only secure and permanent assurance and is well nigh certain of final perseverance, for the child "trained up in the way he should go when he is old will not depart from it." The convert of a day is not to be discouraged but he has not the basis and foundation such as is steadily grown in years, his way is thorny with old habits developed from the natural evil. Many of the efforts thus which should be expended on establishing the faith are exhausted in trying to effect justification and conversion—planting but not cultivating fruit. Evangelists and revivalists are not apt at training, but notably leave the field as soon as the soil seems seeded. The Church's strength is in training,—in bringing up the young in their early most holy faith—the only principle capable of Christian nurture.

But now we are not left in ignorance of the way this life-principle is to be nurtured. The conduct of the nurture is suggested by the nature of the principle. The doctrine of "training" and "bringing up" implies that the Christian youth are to be led and guided in the gracious sphere in which they begin. The identical elements of the original baptismal life are to be wrought into stronger parts. The trust which a child has in a mother when not disappointed, deceived or discouraged even by a look, by

temper or tone of voice is trained into abiding confidence. So repentance for disobedience and confession of wrong are also taught until in the course of time the ideas of government, obedience, trust and love, rise into their grander significance before God the heavenly parent and his divine government, in which the child is indeed unwittingly being trained. The Holy Spirit in all these experiences is thus deepening his work. The restraints and chastisements as well as the daily teaching of patience are the administrations of the parental priesthood, by which process the child is increased in grace as by a sacrament—indeed this training is a constantly new application of the baptism in whose covenant the parent has agreed to bring up the infant subject in renouncing sin and growing in the works of grace and of the Spirit, and as the Spirit enlarges the mind the vows of the covenant are held up before the child, and by that sign the young heart is taught the filth of the flesh, the cleansing purity of Christ, and how it should die in its sinful nature and live in Christ. Thus the child is comforted and its hope brightened; and should a relapse occur that sign is meant like the rainbow after the deluge, to encourage the wandering soul to hope on and trust still in the unchanging promise. This recalling to remembrance the sacrament of infancy, like the ever recurring commemoration of the Lord's Passion, in the eucharist, renews and reinvigorates the original baptismal grace. The virtue of this first sacrament is so perpetuated as never to leave any, not even the child, without the means [benefits?] of a sacrament. At every turn therefore in the experiences and culture of the youth this remembrance with prayer for, and faith in behalf of, this first rite constitutes a substantial duty. The youth must learn to cherish the vows of his infancy as his own vows, and so piously expects from them perennial blessings, as the saintly Arndt and Spener and others were accustomed to pray God to bless their baptism and to help them keep the engagement. How much more then in the instructions from the divine word should not these vows be kept prominently in view. Law for the Christian is a rule of living and specially needful for the inexperienced. Catechisation and Bible teaching are therefore primarily and most fitly designed to inform the young Christian

in a knowledge of the divine will towards him and to lead him to fulfill his duty to the Lord. And as the life begun within has in germ the complete Christian stature, conscientiousness in daily living, the proper direction of the necessary faculty of amusement and all the duties and activities demanded in the Lord's vineyard, are here enforced and put to exercise. This is "edification"—building up the young believer in his already holy calling.

But further than this, through the union of that life with the body of Christ, and thence particularly with the Christian home, it appears that the most sacred alliances of affection and company and various daily influences, necessarily have part in shaping the feelings and thoughts of the child. The earliest grace, just as the innate evil, is developed through the eye and other experiences with voice, temper and conduct as a sign-language, an administered word. Every association of a Christian nature enhances this life of faith as pure air does tree and flower. On the other hand the touch of evil society harms the tender branch in its symmetry and future fruitfulness. Particularly harmful must be then the school where secular advances and temporal successes are set forth as the noblest end of life, and that too by unbelieving or erratic teachers who exert their peculiar influence of example and opinion upon the children at their most pliable age. In these organic relations there is the greater value therefore of pious example and of prayer on the part of parents and other Christians, as a perpetual means of training this sensitive life. The faith of Lois in these mutual vital channels was likewise breathed and transferred into the grandson Timothy through an intervening generation even, and still leaping vigorously in his spiritual veins. And what profound significance and power there is in teaching and preaching the divine word still quick and powerful with inspiration, where hearts are so divinely made susceptible. To teach Christian children by example and by precept is to be angel messengers to these heirs of salvation.

ARTICLE III.

HAVE WE THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE?

Translated from the German of Prof. Mühlen, D. D., by the REV. B.
PICK, PH. D., Allegheny, Pa.

INTRODUCTION BY THE TRANSLATOR.

During the month of February, 1884, the professors W. Volck and F. Mühlen* in Dorpat delivered two lectures in the university hall. The former had for his theme: "How far are we to attribute freedom of error to the Bible?"† "The address," says Prof. Curtiss,‡ "is significant as coming from a pupil of Professor Delitzsch and from one who has the reputation in Germany of being very conservative. Instead of affirming that the Bible is a revelation from God, he maintains that it is a document of that revelation. He objects to the definition that "it is that book, which in a clear and sufficient manner, teaches what we must believe to gain eternal life," since "it contains much more, and almost three-fourths of the Bible could be dispensed with if this definition were correct." He holds that the effort to prove the errorless character of the Bible in matters of science and chronology is to divert our attention from it as a foundation, and to put us on our guard lest it be drawn away from under our feet. On the other hand, he affirms that to doubt the historical character of Abraham is to smite the head from the history of redemption, and protests against the assumption that the peculiar religious character of the people of Israel was not stamped upon them on Mount Sinai, but was the result of a gradual development."

To remove possible offenses, which his colleague might have given, Prof. Mühlen delivered the address which is here given

*Both are known as the editors of Gesenius' *Hebr. und Chald. Handwörterbuch*, Leipsic, 1878.

†"In wie weit ist der Bibel Irrthumslosigkeit zuzuschreiben?" Dorpat, 1884.

‡*Current Discussions in Theology*, Vol. III, p. 37 seq. Chicago, 1885.

in English. Both lectures made nevertheless a great stir in many circles, especially in those of the ministers, and pastor N. von Nolck in Oesel published a rejoinder entitled *Zur Inspirations frage** in which he not only accuses the lecturers but the entire faculty of having apostatized from the faith. The theological value of the rejoinder is, according to a German critic, little; but its importance was enhanced, inasmuch as it announced itself to be the "confession" of the Oesel synod. Lively controversies in papers and pamphlets followed. To put a stop, the professor emeritus Theodor Harnack published *Ueber den Kanon und die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift. Ein Wort zum Frieden*,† in which he takes issue with those who make the Scripture instead of Christ, the ground and corner-stone of faith and revelation. Whatever one may think of the lectures of Volck and Mühlen, there was no just reason for publicly accusing them, or the entire faculty, of a "manifest apostasy from the belief in the Holy Scriptures." In a chivalrous manner Harnack declares himself to be one and all with the faculty.

These introductory remarks will explain why we have ventured to give Mühlen's lecture in English.

Have we the original text of the Holy Scripture? What a question! Shall *this* not even be certain, that we have the pure text of the Bible word?—Thus sadly, or at least full of amazement the laymen ask.

And on the other hand I hear the man of science, above all the philologist, say: Have we the original text? Why this question? For the question here cannot be *whether* the received form of the text of the Old and New Testaments deviates from the original—this must be asserted from the very start—but, to what degree this is the case. For in truth, how should we have received the text of a book literally faithful, which contains portions, older perhaps than two thousand years, and whose most recent writings were composed nearly eighteen centuries ago? of a book which was circulated through many centuries, in some parts through thousands of years, and this by means of multiplying the manuscripts?

*Riga, 1885.

†Dorpat, 1885.

But will the layman say, who lived in the firm belief to possess in his Bible the only, pure source of truth: The Scripture is not such a book like other books; and how could this book of books be for me the infallible word of God, when what I read to day in my printed Bible can no more be regarded with certainty as that which the prophets and the apostles have written down?

Correct as this objection appears to be to the simple, faithful mind, equally decided must I protest in the interest of our evangelical faith, against such a conception. For it presupposes an opinion of the Scripture as the word of God, which is contrary to the living Protestant conception and binds us to the word of Scripture in a legally external manner.

You have recently heard in this place from the mouth of my colleague* who defended the thesis, which every evangelical theologian must fully and entirely subscribe, that the Scripture is not directly *the* revelation, but only a *witness* of the revelation. My object to day is, by answering my thesis, to give you the historical proof of it, that only the latter conception of Holy Writ can be true. In doing this, I undertake to treat questions before you, which on account of their complicated nature and on account of the many details, which must be considered, are usually discussed only among professional men; but the importance of these questions is so great, the interest connected with answering the same, as a matter of course, touches us all so deep, that I will nevertheless undertake to initiate you into these literary minutiae.

Let us commence with the *Old Testament*. Its original language, as is known, is the Hebrew, only in some portions of the books of Daniel and Ezra, the Aramaic. In the case of the Old Testament it seems to be at the first glance, that our present text presents the most speaking evidence, that the hand of divine providence has kept it from the general fate of the literature handed down in manuscript. For not only do the printed edi-

*[Referring to the lecture of Prof. Volck: "In wie weit ist der Bibel Irrthumslosigkeit zuzuschreiben?" (*i. e.* in how far can infallibility be ascribed to the Bible?).—Tr.]

tions of the Hebrew text, but also all manuscripts, agree with each other, saving some unimportant matters. What this means will be clear when I indicate with a few words what our manuscripts and editions of the Hebrew Old Testament contain. The text proper is, as is the case with all Semitic languages (the Ethiopic excepted), a consonant text. But to the consonants are added partly below, partly above, partly within the same, a number of points, strokes and other small signs. Some of them serve to regulate the pronunciation of the consonants, others express the vowels with which the consonants are to be pronounced (the "vowel-points"), and others finally (the so-called "accents") serve as logical signs of division (somewhat like our signs of interpunctuation) or as musical signs to regulate the cantilating lecture in the synagogue. Added to this are marginal notes, which refer to the consonants, vowel-points and accents of the text, and at the end of the books the detailed statements of the number of chapters and verses, yea, even of the words and letters of each book. These marginal notes also indicate *e. g.* with great minuteness the consonants which differ from the common form of the text, which are to be written larger or smaller than the others, or are to stand above the line and the like. These additions to the text are called the "mas-sora," *i. e.* tradition, and our Hebrew text of the Old Testament is therefore called the "massoretic."

As has already been stated, our present editions agree with oldest editions of the fifteenth century, as well as with the oldest manuscripts extant (of the XI. and XII. cent.), in all these particulars, saving the marginal notes and those at the end, which are wanting here and there, or are not complete.

We may well perceive how pious uncriticism would be led to recognize in this fact a clear proof of the inspiration of the Old Testament including even the smallest shades, and how, when in the seventeenth century loud voices were heard against such a conception, an embittered controversy was opened concerning the question whether the vowel-points and accents were original parts of the text and whether they are inspired or not.

Aside from other considerations, the very fact that the official manuscripts of the Old Testament which were used in the syna-

gogue service and which could only contain the rare text, should have been sufficient to restrain from the former assumption. Already Luther had the correct knowledge; he calls the additions to the consonant text "a new invention of men," from which one may deviate, whenever the sense requires it.

Far be it from me to underrate the value of the traditional punctuation of the Hebrew text. On the contrary, it is a commentary on the Old Testament, which must be regarded as one of the greatest exegetical efforts of all times; a commentary—supposed that our consonant text to be correct—which we can follow in most cases. And yet it is only a commentary, which, as we now know, is very recent when we consider the antiquity of the text, upon which it comments. The punctuation was not commenced before the sixth century of our era, and was completed in the eighth.

The Talmud, which was completed in the fifth century, knows not yet the vowel points and accents; and Jerome declares expressly, that the Hebrew manuscripts contain nothing but the consonant-text. But—and this is of the greatest importance for our text—the Talmud offers no other text than the one which we still have. It knows not even various readings, it rather traces back in many instances the reading to the oldest tradition. Yea, more than this; the Talmud already understands the consonant text of the Old Testament in the same manner, as it was afterwards fixed by vowels and accents.

Still further back we find the same text. Jerome who translated the Holy Scriptures into Latin about the year 400, a translation, which under the name of the Vulgate by a decree of the Council of Trent as the "authentic edition" was made co-equal with the original text of the Bible by the Church of Rome, and Origen in the first half of the third century, and so likewise the Aramaic translations of the Old Testament which originated in Babylon—all evidently appear to have already perused our consonant text.

Whence this remarkable agreement? How is this stability in the tradition to be explained, which has not the like in the history of those literary circles, which are nearer to us? Should this really be regarded as a proof, that our text does not essen-

tially differ from the original form ? For such an assumption the generally conceded fact seems also to speak that the transmitted text is of an undoubtedly high value. This is already evident to the student because of the numerous differences in the pronunciation and mode of expression which must necessarily be expected on account of the periods lying far apart, within which the single parts of the Old Testament were composed. Dialectic peculiarities and many other characteristics in form and grammar are here evidently faithfully preserved. Thus we see that not an unforming hand has effaced the differences of time and place or the individuality of the authors.

The answer to that often repeated question I will give further on. Let us, however, go still farther back, to the age of Jesus and the apostles, to the century, in which the books of the New Testament originated.

It is a fact, which by some observation, can also not escape the attention of the layman, that only the fewest of the Old Testament citations in the New Testament fully agree with the wording of the Old Testament. This of course in many instances explains itself from the fact, that the authors of the New Testament writings quoted from memory, or—what can be proved in many instances—that they intentionally changed the wording of the Old Testament. In most cases, however, it is evident, that they had the Hebrew text of the Old Testament neither before their eyes nor in their memory, but the text of that Greek translation of the Old Testament, which, as is evident from Philo and Josephus, was used by all Greek speaking Jews of that time beside or as a rule in place of the Hebrew Old Testament. I mean that translation, which in the main belongs to the third century before Christ and which was made by learned Alexandrian Jews. An old tradition makes it to be the work of seventy-two translators—a most significant number: it alludes to six translators from each of the twelve tribes of Israel;—afterwards the number seventy has been given as a round number. This Greek translation is generally called the Septuagint, *i. e.* the work of the seventy. It is an invaluable, yea the most important testimony for the history of the Old Testament text in the pre-Christian time.

True we have it only in a much corrupt text; true that those learned Alexandrians translated the Hebrew text very often in a free manner, often also wrong on account of a deficient knowledge of the language and matter, yea they were not even afraid to make arbitrary additions here and there,—but in spite of all that, it may be perceived with full certainty, that the text, which was before them, in many passages materially differed from our received text.

Thus for instance we see that the book of Jeremiah, in the Hebrew text of the Septuagint had not only another order of its constituent parts, but also that the single addresses and historical sections were much shorter. There the book had only about seven-eighths of the size of our Hebrew Jeremiah. There evidently existed an entirely different recension of this prophetic book. Similar is the case with the book of Proverbs. Here a number of proverbs are wanting, which are found in our Hebrew text, while on the other hand a number of proverbs are wanting in our Hebrew text, which are found in the Septuagint. In both these cases the matter concerns different recensions or redactions of the books in question. Elsewhere, for instance in the book of Samuel (the first and second book of Kings in the Septuagint), numerous differences refer to single words of the text. Finally it can be proved or at least be made highly probable from the text of the Septuagint, that our Hebrew Old Testament shows gaps, which can be filled from the Septuagint. Thus in placing the Judaic cities enumerated in the 15th chapter of the book of Joshua upon a map, according to our Old Testament text, a region south of Jerusalem, round about Bethlehem (this included), remains vacant. This gap can be supplemented from the translation of the Septuagint, as the text which they perused was uninterrupted. Similar supplements may perhaps be made from the Greek text of the book of Kings.

Whatever one may think of the value of the Alexandrian recension, certain it is that it offers the actual evidence that there existed Hebrew manuscripts in the pre-Christian time, which had a text essentially different from ours; a text, which in many respects, be it only in a few cases, is to be preferred to ours.

We can even go a step farther and say, that the received text

is a proof, that in older times there existed different recensions, that soon after the composition of single books different texts formed themselves, yea, that the authors of our Old Testament books, the sources which they perused, already perused in different recensions. Or in what other way should we explain the fact, that none of the many duplicates in the Old Testament as far as the words are concerned, do not agree with each other? Thus we read that beautiful song of David, Ps. 18, in the second book of Samuel (ch. 22) in an essentially different recension. The same may be said of the duplicates in the book of Proverbs, of the genealogical lists in the Pentateuch and Chronicles, and of other parts. They are all a speaking proof, that the original text was changed in the course of time, and this in part to some extent.

And how could it be otherwise? We must not forget the fate which the books composed by the holy singers, prophets, historians of Israel, had necessarily to experience. Let us also suppose, that many an original copy has been preserved through some centuries. This is not so improbable, since most of them were written on skins, more seldom on linen. But it is hardly to be conceived that the copies which were made from most autographs at a very early time, were controlled by the latter. And how often may some books have been copied, especially such which above all were for the private use, as, *e. g.* the book of Proverbs. How often may copies have been made from poor copies. Or should there only have been faithful copies? Have we a right to judge the literature of Israel by another standard than we do with the other literature of the world, which has been propagated by manuscripts?

Yes, *here* errors were nearer at hand than in the case of the Græco-Roman literature. The Semitic writing, as has already been remarked, from the very beginning only designated the consonants. Besides, the words were not, as is already the case in the oldest inscriptions, separated from each other by paragraphs or points. A book roll written in the ancient Hebrew presented itself as an undisturbed continuous series of consonants from beginning to end; a fact, which must be regarded as the source of numerous mistakes. For even those readers and

copyists, who understood the language, must have had their doubts here and there, how to divide the letters into words, and with which vowels the consonants should be pronounced. This, however, gave rise to numberless errors in reading, and mistakes in copying.

In ancient times the characters, in which they wrote in Israel, were totally different from those of our manuscripts and printed editions. We now know very well the ancient Israelitish writing. A few years ago an inscription was found in a canal, which connects the spring of St. Mary of Jerusalem with the pool of Siloah. It probably belongs to the time of Hezekiah. The large inscription on the monument of King Mesha of Moab from the beginning of the ninth century, consisting of 34 lines, shows in the main the same characters.* This writing was certainly used in Israel till the time of the exile. On the Aramaic soil there was another Semitic writing, preserved to us in numerous seals, coins, papyri and inscriptions, and which may be traced back to the 8th century before Christ. It is mentioned Ezra 4 : 7, where we read that the enemies of the Jews in Jerusalem wrote a letter to King Artaxerxes, written in the Syrian tongue. Through the influence of this Aramaic writing, at the time when the Jews exchanged the Hebrew of their fathers for the Aramaic colloquial language, the old Hebrew writing was by degrees entirely transformed, till at last an entirely new writing originated, which, to distinguish it from the irregular marks of the older, was very regularly formed, so that each letter can exactly be put in a square, whence this writing was also called the square-writing. In it not a few inscriptions of Palestine are written, which in part are older than our era. In this writing it is true the yod is the smallest letter of the alphabet, in it the letters are adorned with small spire-like ornaments, called in Greek "tittles," and this will explain the saying of the Lord (Matt. 5 : 18): "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law."

*[Reference is made to the *Moabite Stone*. A fac-simile of the inscription together with an English translation is found in McClintock and Strong's *Cyclop.* s. v. *Mesha*. For a complete history and literature comp. Ginsburg *The Moabite Stone*, 2d ed., London, 1871.—Tr.]

During the period, comprising many centuries, in which the gradual change of the writing was effected for this very reason, many a mistake has crept into the received text. Ere the fluctuating, irregular characters gave way to the later and regular ones, the writing itself offered more occasion for changing the letters to the scribes than was the case, in spite of many similar letters, with the square writing which from the time of Jesus to our days has experienced hardly any change.

In fine there is yet a last, and very important point, which must be mentioned. Let us not forget: the Israelites before the exile regarded most of the books, which we now hold as holy writings, as very precious, but not yet as holy before others. Many a writing, which we have no more, was regarded equally as precious as those, which have been preserved. From the book of Chronicles we learn that Isaiah wrote a history of King Uzziah; other prophetic and historical books are there also mentioned, which certainly were regarded no less than many prophetic and historical books, which are now parts of our Old Testament. But of the anxious care of later periods, to preserve the received letter, faithfully, there is certainly not the least indication. It was only in the time of Ezra, the "scribe," when the learned occupation, at first with the law, commenced, when by degrees they commenced to distinguish what should be regarded as holy or not of the received literature, only then they commenced to fulfill in an external manner of the word, what the apostle Paul (Rom. 3 : 3) designates as the prerogative of Israel, to preserve "what has been intrusted to them, the oracles of God." From this time on, value was attached to the received letter of the Scripture, now the question was raised, and by degrees it was solved through a work of many centuries, what should be regarded as the genuine text of Moses and the prophets. At this time passages like Deut. 4 : 2 ("Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you") were interpreted with regard to the external keeping of the received letter of the text, instead of taking them as the rule of a living, inward obedience. In this sense Josephus asserts in his apology con-

cerning the antiquity of the Jewish people against Apion, the learned heathen of Alexandria, that the Jews distinguish themselves before all nations of the world in that they have 22 divinely credited writings, to whose text none would dare to add or to take away anything from it.

When Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans (70 A. D.), the Jews formed for themselves a new center at Jamnia, situated a few miles west from Jerusalem, not far from the sea. Here resided, after the high priesthood had ceased with the cessation of the temple-worship, the nasi or patriarch, who was now regarded as the spiritual head of the Jews. He was also the president of the spiritual academy, where the study of Scripture was cultivated, and where on the basis of an anxiously literal interpretation of the law of the fathers all important questions of sacred jurisprudence, which rose everywhere among the Jews, were decided. Later, the seat of the nasi was transferred to Tiberias on the lake of Genesareth, and the heathenish city founded by Herod Antipas, on whose unhallowed soil once no Jew would have lived, now became the much-admired and frequented center of the Jews. Here at any rate the last hand was laid on the redaction of the Old Testament text. The authority of this spiritual central jurisdiction of Israel explains it, that this text was everywhere received. It is the same text, which the Talmud already looked upon as impalpable; it is the same which we have now.

And because since the fourth and fifth centuries after Christ, we have everywhere only one and the same text—leaving here aside the variations of the so-called German and Spanish manuscripts—it has been thought that this enigma can only be solved on the hypothesis of deriving all our Old Testament manuscripts from one individual archetype. And one of our greatest orientlists even undertook to prove whence this archetype. Sixty years after the destruction of Jerusalem the Jews of Palestine once more arose in a bloody insurrection against the Roman power. They were headed by a Pseudo-Messiah, who, after the prophecy of Balaam (Numb. 24 : 17) called himself Bar Cochba, "son of the star." After an obstinate struggle he was obliged

to retire with his people to the fortress Bether. On the ninth day of Ab, on the same day on which soldiers of Titus had thrown fire into the Herodian temple, it was taken by the Romans. Five hundred and eighty thousand Jews are said to have perished then. That archetype, Lagarde thinks, has been saved from the catastrophe of Bether. This is a vain conception, which in no wise can be made historically acceptable.*

Our Hebrew text is rather the result of a quiet work of the Jewish scribes, especially of the first centuries of our era, maturing by degrees. It represents the relatively best text, which can be historically established, but it is by no means the original text. As to the proportion in which it deviates from the same, we can only make conjectures but we have no certainty.

How is it with the text of the *New Testament*, which, as is well known, was written in the Greek language? Only a few years ago a rumor went round in different papers that one of the epistles of the apostle Peter has been recovered in his original. Numerous as are the surprises which were bestowed on the science of our days by the discoveries in old historical ground, a manuscript of the apostle will surely never be seen. Already Irenaeus, toward the end of the second century, while endeavoring to solve the enigma of the number 666 (Apocal. 13 : 18), could only consult copies,† and neither he nor other

*[Lagarde is not the only one who believes in an archetype. Lagarde's view is expressed in his *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien*, Leipsic, 1863, p. 2. Thirty years before Lagarde, E. F. K. Rosenmüller in the preface to the Hebrew Bible published by Tauchnitz, Leipsic, 1834, already wrote the following: "Qui hodie exstant codices omnes ita inter se conspirant, ut ex aliquot centenis variis lectionibus vix una deprehendatur, quae sensum mutet. Circa unam duntaxat vel alteram literam, vocalem vel accentum versantur. Quod quidem argumento est, O. T. libros, prouti eos nunc legimus, ex unius quam dicunt recensionis codicibus ad nos transmissos esse, atque omnes codices, antiquiores aequae qui perierunt, ac recentiores quos habemus, tamquam e communi fonte fluxisse." The same view is held by Kamphausen in the 3d ed. of Bleek's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 733, note; by Wellhausen in the 4th ed. of same work, p. 620 seq.; by Stade in his *Hebrew Grammar*, p. 20 and *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, p. 32. The most recent exponent of this view is Robertson Smith in his *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (New York 1883), p. 74 seq.—TR.]

†[*Adv. Haeres*, v, 30, 1.—TR.]

fathers of the first centuries know anything of the existence of the apostolic autographs. And this is not surprising. In the time of the apostles, as a rule they wrote on paper, which is also expressly mentioned in the second epistle of St. John (v. 12). This was a very perishable material, since the "*charta Augusta*," on account of being fine, was especially used in letter-writing. Now it is true that some Egyptian papyri have been preserved, which as has been proved are older than four thousand years. But during all this time they remained intact in the dry, dead-chambers of Egypt, which shut out the destroying dampness. The New Testament paper manuscripts, on the other hand, circulated from hand to hand, may be also from congregation to congregation. True there also existed parchment. You remember perhaps the passage in the second epistle to Timothy (4 : 13), in which Paul asks Timothy to bring with him the parchments. But the parchment then used was of a finer, less durable kind. Thus you will not be surprised to learn, that our oldest manuscripts of the New Testament do certainly not reach back beyond the middle of the fourth century. From *that* time on parchment was exclusively used, and this was stronger, more durable than the former.

I hardly need to remark that the New Testament—already during the first centuries of the Christian Church—has often been copied. True, relatively seldom the entire New Testament. Generally the manuscripts contained either the gospels, or the Pauline epistles, or the Acts of the Apostles with the catholic epistles, or finally the Revelation. Manuscripts containing the whole New Testament (and to this class, we are happy to say, belong our very oldest and most valuable ones), generally also contain the Old Testament in the Greek translation of the Septuagint, the oldest among them, also some other writings as the epistle of Barnabas and the shepherd of Hermas, which, besides our New Testament writings, were then in ecclesiastical use.

The manuscripts written until the tenth century, are written with large letters, and are therefore called "*codices majusculae*," or uncial manuscripts. Of such 65 have been preserved, cer-

tainly few considering what was once extant, but nevertheless a very magnificent number, when we bear in mind that of the entire comprehensive Greek literature hardly one tenth of as many manuscripts of equal antiquity have come down to us. Finally we also have more than 1200 minuscule manuscripts from the ninth to the sixteenth century. Many of them are already written on cotton—or linen paper and in book form (instead of the older roll form.)

Of this large number of manuscripts not two do agree with each other. The variations number by thousands; few verses of the New Testament only will be read alike in all manuscripts. What the manuscripts prove, the numerous New Testament citations in the writings of the Church-fathers confirm, and no less the oldest translations of the New Testament into Latin and into the Egyptian and Semitic dialects. They all also prove how fluctuating the text was read. On the other hand we must not omit to mention expressly that the critical material which is thus presented to us by manuscripts, translations and quotations in the Patristic literature, must be regarded as so complete that no passage of the New Testament which is not disputed by the same, can no more be looked upon as doubtful as to its originality.

The complaint over a corrupt text is as old as the text itself. Already the oldest writings which quote New Testament passages, show a corrupt text. The judgment of the Church-fathers is unanimous. Let us hear what Origen (in the first half of the third century) says in his commentary on the gospel of Matthew: "In the copies (of the New Testament) we have a great many various readings; they may either come from the carelessness of the copyists, or from the boldness of such, who endeavored to correct the text in a bad manner, or finally from the copyists who omitted or added at random."

Of late it has been taught to divide the extant manuscripts into certain groups. The oldest belong to the so-called Alexandrino-Egyptian family. They offer a text, which was especially used by the Jewish Christians of the Orient. To it belong the Codex Vaticanus at Rome, probably the most valuable and oldest of all our manuscripts; also the so-called Sinaitic manu-

script discovered by Tischendorf in the Catharine-Convent of Mount Sinai (the only complete manuscript now extant), now the main ornament of the Imperial public library at St. Petersburg.

Another group is usually called the "Latin" or "Western" family, though its text also originated in the Orient. To it belong the old Græco-Latin manuscripts, as well as the text which forms the basis of the old Latin translation, the origin of which may be traced back to the second century.

A third group is nominated the Græco-Asiatic family. The text which this group offers seems to go back to a recension, which was made, on the basis of a comparison of manuscripts, in the Syrian Church. May be that the presbyter Lucian of Antioch (†311), a founder of the famous school at Antioch deserved greatly of this recension. It was afterwards officially recognized in the Byzantine State-Church, and is hence the basis of the now received text of the Greek Church. The same text also found its way to the west; we find it in all more recent manuscripts. The manuscripts, too, which Erasmus made the basis of his edition of the New Testament of the year 1516, offer the same text. From this edition proceeded Luther's translation.

It cannot be my object to demonstrate to you, how modern textual criticism on the basis of the existing material has endeavored to restore the original text as far as possible. In spite of the thousands of various readings it has succeeded in clearing our Greek text more and more from received mistakes. And we may say, that in some writings, as in the epistle to the Romans, there will hardly be found any important readings, which are still disputed. To be sure, if you would compare one of our more recent critical editions, like the so-called eighth of Tischendorf's text, or the still more excellent one of Westcott and Hort, with the text of Luther, you would see how radical are some of the changes which were made in the text; how necessary it was to remove from the New Testament such sections as spurious which have become dear to some. But the scientific theologian has the duty to act in accordance with the well-known saying of Tertullian: "Christ has not called himself the custom, but the truth."

I will now demonstrate by a series of passages what has been done and is still to be done by the work of textual criticism, and how far-reaching are some of the changes, which the text of the New Testament has experienced with the time. Only certain results of criticism will I lay before you. Many things must remain to us uncertain for ever. I also omit all the numerous instances which only concern errors in writing or hearing or seeing, and only such instances do I include within the circle of our observations, which concern wilful changes on the side of the copyists. For punctilious clinging to the letter, which distinguished the later Jewish theology, or even the scientific conscientiousness of the exegete, who only cares for the literal sense and the meaning of the author, we must not expect of any of the copyists of the New Testament.

We may yet overlook the fact of which Tatian already complained (about 150 A. D.) that many copyists took the liberty of making all kinds of stylistic emendations in the apostolic texts. No less frequently, however, were also essential corrections, or additions and omissions, of which Origen already complained. Thus, for instance, the first three gospels—the so-called synoptic—were almost throughout arbitrarily supplemented from the parallel accounts, which they offer. The Lord's Prayer in Luther's Bible is given in Luke 11, in essentially the same form as in Matt. 6. Yet the oldest codices teach us, that the third and seventh petition did not belong to the original text of Luke's gospel. By Matthew again we read the familiar clause at the end "for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever. Amen." But Matthew, as the oldest critical witnesses tell, did not write it down, nor did the Lord teach it to his disciples. It has been arbitrarily added by the copyists of Matthew's gospel, probably because it became customary at a very early time in the service of the ancient Church, to add to the Lord's Prayer this liturgical close.

The narrative of the woman taken in adultery in John ch. 8, is certainly no original constituent part of the gospel. It was probably written at first in the margin to 8 : 15, to illustrate the word of Jesus, "Ye judge after the flesh ; I judge no man," and was afterwards thoughtlessly received into the text of the gospel

by subsequent copyists. I say thoughtlessly, because the narrative interrupts in the most striking manner the connection of the narrative of the events on the Feast of Tabernacles. That this story moreover rests on ancient, truthful tradition, I will not deny at all. Less probable is this the case with the entire close of Mark's gospel from 16 : 9 seq. According to the result of textual criticism this must be erased as spurious. The very fact even that Irenæus already read the passage, cannot help us any, for the Vatican and Sinaitic codices have it not yet and other ancient codices have it in an essentially different form, proof enough that it was added only for the sake of giving to Mark's gospel a suitable close, which it had not.

It is worthy of notice that as from Mark the mention of the ascension must be omitted, so likewise from Luke 24 : 51. For the words "and carried up into heaven," following after "and it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them" are according to the oldest witnesses not original. Thus then the fact of the ascension—and why should this not be sufficient for us?—remains expressly attested by the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles alone.*

An arbitrary and at the same time fabulous addition, which does not correspond to the otherwise biblical view has already been made in the oldest manuscripts to the narrative of the healing of the sick at the pool of Bethesda (John ch. 5). The words of the sick, "Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool," which simply suppose the fact of an intermitting spring, as may be still observed at the temple-mount, were the cause of the preceding addition that an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water, etc.

A very late addition of a dogmatical kind is offered by the famous passage 1 John 5 : 7 seq. in the words: "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." These words are not

*[In the Lutheran Church, Mark 16 : 14-20 is read as the gospel for Ascension Day, and sermons are generally preached on that text. The committee for revising Luther's Bible retained that section without any note or comment, and retained the old heading, "Gospel on Ascension Day."—Tr.]

only wanting in all Greek manuscripts before the year 1000, even Luther did not receive them into his translation. Indeed we do not strike out the confession of the holy Trinity, by eliminating these words from the text of the Bible. Since they are certainly not original, since Luther did not even have them in his translation, it is difficult to account for why they are again and again reprinted and are used in the Church as words of the apostle John.*

Let us now pass over to some arbitrary changes of the text, which were made by the copyists. This was done first of all in passages where it was intended to correct a seeming or real mistake. To this class belongs the famous verse Matt. 13 : 35. Jerome tells us that Porphyry, the dangerous Neo-Platonic adversary of Christianity, accused the evangelists of ignorance, because he quoted the words: "I will open my mouth in parables," etc., as words of Isaiah, while they are found in a psalm of Asaph. Porphyry seems to have to read in his manuscript "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet Isaiah, saying" (not simply "by the prophet," as in our German [and also in the English] text. The same we find in the codex Sinaiticus. Should the reading, as Tischendorf thinks, be genuine, we cannot but acknowledge that the apostle Matthew has erred here.

A similar slip of memory is certainly in Matt. 27 : 9; since the there quoted passage is found in Zechariah and not in Jeremiah, as according to almost all manuscripts (Luther too has correctly "Jeremiah"), the evangelist did write. Some manuscripts and translations have here too a correction, by erasing either "Jeremiah," or substituting Zechariah in its place.

In fine allow me to call your attention to two more passages, of which the one was altered in an ethico-ascetical interest, the other out of dogmatical considerations. In Mark 9 : 29 we read: "This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer and fasting." The addition "and fasting" is wanting in the Vatican and Sinaitic codices, but was already added at a very early period

*[This verse forms part of the epistle for the first Sunday after Easter, called "Quasimodogenite." The revision-committee has retained it in the German Bible within brackets and distinguished it by a smaller type.—Tr.]

and generally adopted. It answered to the practical ascetical tendency of the Church; it opposes, however, entirely the evangelical free spirit of the Scripture.

One of the most remarkable changes, to which but recently a more earnest attention has been called, concerns the passage John 1:18. Here Luther* reads in conformity with the later manuscripts: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared *him*." But the oldest manuscripts, as well as all Greek Fathers of the first centuries, read instead of "the only begotten Son," the two Greek words "only begotten" and "God" (both without the article), which must not be translated "the only begotten God," but: he who is the only begotten (viz. Son) is and as such also God (in the predicative sense, in which we read John 1:1 of the eternal word, it was "God"). The reading which arose in the Western Church "the only begotten Son," is probably to explain out of dogmatical anxiety; it was feared that the expression found in the original text, might be misunderstood. Or was it not understood at all? At any rate we have here an instance, in which the work of textual criticism has restored a confession of the divinity of Christ, as the apostolic pen wrote it.†

From the last example you see that the critical labor does by no means endanger the contents of doctrine and faith of the Holy Scripture, as it could appear from the other striking and intentionally chosen examples. You will also have become persuaded that from the received matter of fact it is the object and duty of the theologian, to examine without prejudice the critical witnesses in order to come nearer and nearer to the original text of the Scripture. But you will also have received the impres-

*[So also the A. and Revised Version, and the Revised German.—TR.]

†[Schaff in his *Companion to the Greek Testament and English Version*, p. 432, says: "God only begotten" was originally adopted by the Revisers in the text (as in Westcott and Hort), but afterward relegated to the margin, and the common reading, 'the only begotten Son' retained in the text (as in Tischendorf, and as suggested by the American Committee). The evidence is nearly equally balanced." Comp. also p. 194 seq.—TR.]

sion, that it is not only difficult, but absolutely impossible, to restore everywhere the original text of the Scripture.

Shall this fact make us despair of the truth of the contents of the Scripture. No, certainly not. Only of a mechanical, legal, dead conception of the Scripture, which the evangelical theologian, who follows Luther's bold and courageous faith, must reject. I repeat, what I said at the beginning: The Scripture is not *the* revelation of God. If such were the case, then every "and" and "but," every name and every number would be the word of God. Then, to be sure, we would have despairingly to complain of the corruption of the text and think, what an anxious little faith often enough had thought, that a corrupt Bible-text can no more be rule and guide of faith and life. Indeed, then we would have to expect and to ask out and out of the Scripture, that it would have been preserved to us unchanged in its letter through divine providence. But the Scripture shows the image of him, of whom it testifies (John 5 : 39). It has a divine and a human side: a divine, because it is and remains to the simple belief the unchangeable authentic testimony of the great deeds of God; a human, for men are its authors, and it was transmitted by fallible men to later generations, in ways and by means, not different from those, by which all other literature of antiquity has come down to us.

ARTICLE IV.

THE AMERICAN INTER-SEMINARY MISSIONARY ALLIANCE.

By REV. WILLIAM E. HULL, A. B., Hudson, N. Y.

The American Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance has become a permanent factor among the evangelical institutions of the Christian Church of America. But little has appeared in our church periodicals in reference to it. An account of the origin and aim of this association and the attitude of the Lutheran Church to it may be of interest to many readers, and also may be of much advantage to the Alliance in the furtherance of its desire to bring all the orthodox seminaries of our land into one common bond of union in the prosecution of a work in which all are deeply interested—and none more so than the Lutheran Church.

The movement originated during the year 1879 among the students of the theological seminary at Princeton, and sprang from a desire for some co-operation of theological students in the various seminaries in promoting the cause of missions. At about the same time the students of the theological seminary at Hartford, moved by a similar impulse, addressed a circular letter upon the same subject to the students of various seminaries. After considerable correspondence between the members of different institutions, the holding of an Inter-Seminary Convention was deemed the most feasible of the various plans suggested, for the accomplishment of the ends in view. In response to a letter sent from Princeton a preliminary conference was held in New York city, April 9th, 1880, at which twenty-two delegates, representing twelve seminaries, were present. Other seminaries sent letters approving the general plan. This preliminary convention adopted a resolution to hold an inter-seminary convention for the discussion of themes bearing on the relation which we are to sustain to the work of Home and Foreign Missions, whether we labor as missionaries abroad, or as pastors at home.

In pursuance to a call of the executive committee, created at

this preliminary convention, the first annual convention of the American Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance assembled in the Second Reformed church in New Brunswick, N. J., Thursday, October 21st, 1880, at 2.45 P. M., where the delegates were received by an address of welcome, by Rev. Dr. Woodbridge, of the New Brunswick Theological Seminary.

The writer, after much correspondence, at last succeeded in obtaining an account of the first convention, which was published in a missionary magazine, entitled *The Gospel in all Lands*, (November, 1880)—copies of which are very scarce. We therefore include the representation, organization and declarations of this first convention.

The committee on enrollment reported the following seminaries represented, with the number of students present from each: Allegheny Seminary (Covenanter), Allegheny, Pa., 1; United Presbyterian Seminary, Allegheny, Pa., 1; Western Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Allegheny, Pa., 3; Andover Seminary (Congregational), Andover, Mass., 10; Auburn Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Auburn, N. Y., 6; Bates College (Free Baptist), Lewiston, Me., 1; Boston University (Methodist), Boston, Mass., 3; Chicago Baptist Seminary, Chicago, Ills., 2; Chicago Congregational Seminary, Chicago, Ills., 2; Presbyterian Seminary of the North West, Chicago, Ills., 2; Crozer Theological Seminary (Baptist), Chester, Pa., 8; Danville Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Danville, Ky., 2; Drew Theological Seminary (Methodist), Madison, N. J., 23; Garrett Biblical Institute (Methodist), Evanston, Ills., 2; German Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Bloomfield, N. J., 1; Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., 1; Madison University, Theological Department (Baptist), Hamilton, N. Y., 2; Hartford Theological Seminary (Congregational), Hartford, Conn., 5; Knox College (Presbyterian), Toronto, Canada, 2; Reformed Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa., 2; Lane Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Cincinnati, Ohio, 1; Lincoln Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Oxford, Pa., 3; Reformed Theological Seminary (Reformed Dutch), New Brunswick, N. J., 34; Newton Theological Seminary (Baptist) Newton Centre, Mass., 3; Oberlin Theological Seminary (Congregational), Ober-

lin, Ohio, 1; Princeton Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Princeton, N. J., 64; Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va., 4; Rochester Theological Seminary (Baptist), Rochester, N. Y., 2; Union Theological Seminary (Southern Presbyterian), Hampden-Sidney, Va., 1; Yale Theological Seminary (Congregational), New Haven, Conn., 7. Total Seminaries, 31. Total denominations, 11. Total students, 242.

The committee on permanent organization presented the following report:

1. This organization shall be called "The American Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance."

2. The aim of this Alliance shall be the furtherance of practical interest in, and consecration to, Foreign and Home Missions on the part of theological students, both as prospective missionaries and prospective pastors.

3. All evangelical theological seminaries which, through their delegates present at any convention, or in any other way, shall express a desire and readiness to coöperate for the furtherance of the aim of this Alliance, as set forth in article 2d, shall, upon application to the correspondence and publication committee, provided for in article 6th, be recognized as members of this Alliance.

4. At each convention, this Alliance shall determine the time and place for its next convention.

5. All business connected with the holding of the conventions of this Alliance, shall be placed in the hands of a convention committee. This committee shall be composed of five members, from different denominations, and shall hold office until the election of their successors by the convention next following.

6. There shall be a correspondence and publication committee, composed, elected, and retaining office similarly with the convention committee. It shall be the duty of this committee: First, to collect from theological seminaries, to publish, and to circulate amongst the seminaries, all information of interest to the Alliance; Second, to encourage the organization of missionary societies in seminaries, and to stimulate those already

existing to increased efficiency; and, Third, to take such other measures as are calculated to further the ends of this Alliance. This committee shall have power to appoint such sub-committee as they shall deem necessary to aid them in their work.

7. These articles of organization may be altered or supplemented by a two-thirds vote of the seminaries represented in any regular convention of this Alliance, provided that every seminary of this Alliance has been notified, through the correspondence and publishing committee, of the proposed change, at least two months before the meeting of that convention.

The committee on resolutions made the following report:

We the representatives of the American Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance, in convention assembled, clasping hands and exchanging greetings in the close bond of a common service and a common hope, desire to give expression to our interest and sympathy in the missionary work of the Church by the following resolutions:

1. That the addresses and discussions of this convention, have given us a more profound and intelligent appreciation of the importance of missionary work at home and abroad.

2. That the divine command, "Go, ye!" standing, as it does, between the assurances of omnipotence and omnipresence; the example of our Divine Master himself, the great missionary of the race; the inspiring success of missionary effort throughout the past; the present unparalleled prosperity of Christian missions; the opening doors of eastern empires; the aggressions of Romanism and infidelity, with all their attendant evils; and, above all, the burning love for immortal souls in every Christian heart;—all these unite in impressing upon us the solemn, earnest, individual appeal to consecrate ourselves to the work of discipling the nations.

3. That we, therefore, call upon ourselves, and those whom we represent, to look with conscientious and prayerful scrutiny upon any reason why we should not aspire to the honor of joining those who have given their lives to the grandest enterprise that any age has inaugurated,—the reclaiming of a world to Christ.

4. That we are resolved, that, by divine grace, wheresoever our lot may be cast, we will not be indifferent to, or neglectful

in regard to the claims of missionary work, and the means of promoting its success.

5. That the students of the theological seminaries, represented in this Alliance, take this opportunity to extend a hearty "God-speed" to all missionaries throughout the world; and to assure them of our sincerest interest and prayers in behalf of their momentous work.

6. That the thanks of this convention are heartily tendered to the business committee, whose untiring labors have resulted in this successful and enthusiastic meeting; to the students of the New Brunswick Seminary, who have so kindly invited us to this place, and provided for our entertainment; to the churches which have so generously afforded us the use of their edifices; to the good people of New Brunswick, who have so hospitably opened to us their homes and their hearts; to the railroad companies, for their courtesy in furnishing us passage at reduced rates; and to those individuals, who, by solicitation and donation, have aided in defraying the expenses of this convention.

Papers were read on the following subjects:

"The benefits which the Church at home has derived from missions," by Rev. Wm. M. Taylor, D. D., of New York city; "Missionary work in Italy," by Rev. L. M. Vernon, D. D., of Italy; "The individual appeal and the individual answer," by Rev. Arthur T. Pierson, D. D., of Detroit; "Pastoral responsibility for missions," by Rev. H. M. Scudder, D. D., of Brooklyn; "How may a pastor interest his people in missions?" by Rev. Edward Judson, D. D., of Orange, N. J.; "The Church fundamentally a missionary society," by Mr. W. I. Haven, of Boston Seminary; "The indifference of the Church to the world's evangelization," by Mr. G. N. Luccock, of Allegheny Seminary; "Secular testimony to the success of missions," by Mr. C. M. Cady; "Scope for the best, and most diverse talents, and culture, in missionary work," by Mr. S. J. Harmeling, of New Brunswick Seminary; "The right attitude of young men to the home mission work," by Mr. J. E. Perry, of Crozer Seminary; "Impulses given to missions by theological students," by Mr. Robert Thompson, of Union Seminary; "The present claims of foreign missions upon young men," by Mr. J. G.

Shackelford, of Va.; "What constitutes a call to the mission work," by Mr. F. L. Neeld, of Drew Seminary; "Missionary work and interest in theological seminaries," by Mr. R. M. Mateer, of Princeton Seminary.

The Sunday meetings were as follows:

At 8.30 a meeting of missionaries, and those who expected to go out as missionaries; at 9.00 a consecration meeting; at 10.30 missionary sermons were preached in the various churches; at 2.00 a social meeting of missionaries and those intending to go as missionaries; at 3.15 a missionary mass meeting, at which addresses were made by Rev. Dr. C. W. Mateer, of China, Rev. Narayan Sheshadri, of India, and Rev. Dr. C. H. Fowler, of New York; at night Rev. A. J. Gordon, D. D., of Boston, preached on "The indwelling of the Holy Spirit." A consecration meeting of the students, led by Rev. Dr. Gordon, held after the sermon, closed the convention at New Brunswick. At this convention Mr. O. C. Roth, of Gettysburg Seminary, was made a member of the committee on resolutions.

I have stated the above facts at some length to give an idea of the extended scope and work of the Alliance. In the minutes of the succeeding conventions I find the following facts in reference to Lutheran affiliation and representation:

At the second convention, held at Allegheny City, Pa., October, 1881, Gettysburg, Hartwick and Wittenberg were enrolled as members of the Alliance. Gettysburg only furnished two delegates, viz., Luther Kuhlman and M. F. Troxell—the former acting as a member of the correspondence and publication committee, and the latter as chairman of committee on bills and overtures. Under the heading, "Seminaries represented in the Alliance, and members of sub-committee," I find the following: L. Kuhlman for Gettysburg, B. E. Fake for Hartwick and J. N. Lenker for Wittenberg.

At the third convention, held at Chicago, October, 1882, Mr. L. B. Wolff, of Gettysburg, was the only delegate enrolled from the Lutheran Church. On Friday evening of this convention an address was delivered by Rev. S. A. Ort, D. D., of Wittenberg, on the theme "*Jesus only*." Roanoke was added to the Alliance at this convention.

At the fourth convention, held at Hartford, Conn., October, 1883, Messrs. Geo. D. Gotwald, W. P. Swartz, S. J. Taylor, J. L. Metzger, W. E. Stahler, and C. R. Trowbridge were delegates from Gettysburg. No other Lutheran seminary was represented. W. P. Swartz was appointed a member of committee on enrollment. On Saturday A. M., the 27th, W. E. Stahler read a paper on "How to arouse and maintain missionary interest in the churches."

At the fifth convention, held at Princeton, N. J., October, 1884, Geo. D. Gotwald, F. H. Crissman, W. H. Jordy, L. M. Kuhns, C. J. McDaniel and C. R. Trowbridge represented Gettysburg and W. E. Hull, Hartwick. C. T. McDaniel of Gettysburg was made a member of the executive committee and W. E. Hull, of Hartwick, one of the permanent secretaries of the convention. Geo. D. Gotwald was made a member of the committee on bills and overtures, and the committee on correspondence and publication made the following complimentary mention of him in their report: "We had hoped for several more additions from seminaries which we have urged to unite with us. In this connection we must recognize the valuable aid of brother Geo. D. Gotwald, of Gettysburg Seminary." It was through the influence of brother Gotwald that the writer of this article was induced to attend this convention.

At the sixth convention, held at Rochester, N. Y., October, 1885, C. T. Aikens, S. J. Derr, S. G. Dornblaser, F. H. Crissman, C. L. Fleck, C. B. King, C. T. McDaniel, M. E. McLinn, C. Reinewald, C. H. Schnur and H. L. Yarger represented Gettysburg, and W. E. Hull, Hartwick Seminary. Mr. H. L. Yarger of Gettysburg was appointed chairman at the Saturday morning session. W. E. Hull of Hartwick was made a member of the committee on correspondence and publication. In the roll of seminaries, Missionary Institute, of Selinsgrove, Pa., appears for the first time and Roanoke has dropped out.

It will be seen by the above that all the seminaries of the General Synod have become identified with the Alliance, but there is a lack of proper interest in having well organized missionary societies which will send delegates to each convention.

No seminaries have been represented by delegates at any of the conventions, except Gettysburg and Hartwick. Gettysburg has done *nobly*. But the excuse may be set forth by some of our seminaries that their theological departments are small and it is difficult to provide for the traveling expenses of delegates. Now, one word in regard to this. Where there is a will there is a way. Brother Geo. D. Gotwald wrote me that the plan at Gettysburg was to call upon some of the pastors, friends of the seminary, to have a small collection taken in several churches for this purpose. You will see by the above account that Gettysburg furnished eleven delegates to the last convention. Having obtained permission at Hartwick from the Missionary Society, I sent out a circular for the same purpose and received a light response (probably from the fact that few of our pastors were familiar with the operations of the Alliance), yet enough to pay fare to Princeton and return. Indeed, it was one of the grandest experiences of my life to meet with over 400 young men from the seminaries of our land—all interested in that kingdom which is eternal and in those things which are spiritual. And there still lingers within me a thrill of lofty emotion as I recall the closing session, when the separation was at hand, and many would see each others faces no more upon the earth, and all voices united in repeating the Apostles' Creed and, with bowed heads, the Lord's Prayer, after which hands clasping hands of each other and voice blending with voice in that grand old hymn—

"Blest be the tie that binds,
Our hearts in Christian love,
The fellowship of kindred minds
Is like to that above,"

until there seemed to fall a benediction from heaven, which made the spirit strong and nerved each heart for the struggles of the future.

Now, the above-mentioned plan in reference to collections seems to be simple and ought to receive the attention of our pastors, but the response (yet we are very grateful to those who did respond) came so feebly to my appeal, that it was not pursued again at Hartwick Seminary. The delegate last fall at

Rochester defrayed his own expenses that the seminary might be represented. There can be a small fund secured in the meetings of the Missionary Society by occasional collections among the members themselves by which money can be secured for this purpose, and if the Alliance convention happens to be far away send only one delegate, but, if near, more.

Now, I have had a great interest in the Alliance since I became associated with it, and it is my duty as member of the correspondence and publication committee of the present year to call the attention of our denomination to the necessity of a more vigorous interest. Mr. G. K. Frazer, of Auburn Seminary, chairman of the correspondence and publication committee last year met with the incoming committee at Rochester before the adjournment of the convention and, after specifying the general duties of the committee, said: "You will find most difficulty in getting a representation from the Evangelical Lutheran and from the Protestant Episcopal Church (South)." We certainly should not be lagging behind all the other denominations in this great work, because it certainly is a means of education to all our young men, who are to go into our congregations. Indeed there might be much less trouble for our boards of home and foreign missions to raise money for missionary purposes, if our pastors could have been more thoroughly instructed in the great importance of this work, when they were yet undergraduates.

All cannot attend conventions, but the delegates bring the "good news" back, and, in addition to their reports, printed reports of each convention, containing minutes of the proceedings of the convention and all the addresses and papers printed in full with synopses of discussions, also reports of committees and the enrollment roll with valuable statistics of each seminary. At the last convention \$40 were appropriated by the Alliance for extra copies of the report for gratuitous distribution among the missionaries and clergy of different denominations. As a member of the correspondence and publication committee I have over 50 copies of the last session's report to distribute and will be glad to forward to those who are interested and will apply for a copy to me. Apropos I will add that these reports are ordered by the delegates for themselves and their seminary

societies at each session of the convention at 35 cents apiece, and therefore those receiving the reports of each session from year to year pay for them personally and thereby obtain a compendium of missionary knowledge. The last report is an octavo of 132 pages.

That there may be a clear idea of the function of the committee on correspondence and publication I will make some excerpts from the report of the first committee appointed, which reported at Allegheny City in 1881—copies of which printed report are very scarce.

I. ORGANIZATION AND AIM.

The organization of this committee was the expression of a need that was felt and appreciated by the first convention of the Alliance. This need was two-fold, that of concentration and diffusion.

The different members of the Alliance scarcely knew of the existence of other seminaries not of their creed, and much less of the seminaries themselves. Standing on the broad basis of the world's evangelization, the denominational lines could be lost sight of and a desirable end could be gained by coming into contact with, and learning of, each other. By establishing a bond of sympathy between the theological schools, through the medium of correspondence, it was hoped that the missionary spirit might be focalized. This committee was to be the lens of the Alliance catching and retaining all the convergent rays of inter-seminary missionary intelligence.

But not only was the committee to concentrate, it was also to diffuse. The items of work and interest in the several seminaries needed to be brought to the notice of other seminaries for their encouragement and profit. The coal of missionary spirit that glows brightly in some institutions needed to touch the cold indifferentism that is found in others. Therefore, this lens was not merely to focus and hold the spirit of missionary enterprise that it gathered from various sources, but it was also to send forth again in divergent rays among the theological seminaries of the land this fervent spirit. Such were the prominent needs that led to the formation of this committee; the

need of a careful gathering to be followed by a prudent scattering.

The means proposed to this committee by which to meet these needs were also two-fold in character. The articles of organization adopted by the Alliance required that the committee "collect from theological seminaries all information of interest to the Alliance, to publish and circulate among the seminaries all information of interest to the seminaries; and to urge the formation of missionary societies where not existing and to stimulate to increased efficiency those already formed." In a word, the means were those of publication and correspondence. Hence the name with which the committee was christened. As a collateral aid to its working, power was given to the committee to appoint such sub-committees as were deemed necessary to the better carrying out of its aim. Thus was organized this focalizing power in the Alliance, which was expected to use type and pen in the accomplishment of its work. Its aim was not theoretical only, but practical in the highest and truest sense.

To imbue theological students with a more earnest and devoted consecration to the work of executing the great commission, was the ultimate end and aim both of this committee and of the Alliance which it in part represented.

II. PRACTICAL WORKING.

With a plain statement of facts and figures we will endeavor to portray as nearly as possible the inside working of the committee.

First, dividing the members of Alliance and the outside seminaries along denominational lines as far as possible, each member of the committee took his quota of institutions and entered into correspondence with them. Members of the Alliance were requested to elect or appoint a student to serve as sub-committee of the central committee. Non-members of the Alliance in the United States and Canada were addressed and urged to enroll their names among its membership. The fruit of this correspondence we consider under the head of Results. To each member of the Alliance there was then sent a letter requesting articles for publication. The editors of several religious news-

papers and missionary periodicals were interviewed and space was secured for the insertion of articles received by the committee. At the opening of the present seminary year letters were sent to each member of the Alliance urging the importance of large delegations to the convention and asking for letters of greeting in case representation by delegates was impossible. During the year the committee also distributed through the Alliance various documents furnished by missionary boards. These are the main outlines of the practical working of the committee. Itself an experiment, its work largely pioneer, there were obstacles to overcome and difficulties to be met that will not likely occur to perplex and hinder its successors. Permit, however, a personal word. In all the perplexities of an untried work, carried on amid the ever pressing duties of seminary life, there has been no friction. The most cordial fraternal feeling has characterized all our deliberations. There has been no shirking of details and no serious clashing of opinions. Every personal ambition has been sunk in the grand aim which centers in the Master whose cause we have thus tried to advance. If the aims of the founder of this committee have not been fully realized, it can be shown that some of them were impracticable with the means under the control of the committee.

III. MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

Of the 35 seminaries reporting missionary societies, one holds a bi-monthly meeting, 25 hold monthly, 4 semi-monthly and 4 weekly meetings. The character of these meetings is much the same in all. Addresses or papers on missionary topics are presented by returned missionaries, secretaries of mission boards, members of the seminary faculty or students, with prayer for the field thus brought to notice. One Seminary—Hartford (Cong.)—has both a monthly meeting and a weekly missionary prayer meeting. In Oberlin (Cong.) a missionary band comprised of students personally consecrated and pledged to mission work holds weekly meetings. Thirty-three seminaries report a positive benefit received from the last convention. This benefit is mainly in an increased missionary spirit in the institution, as shown in greater interest in missions and a disposition

more thoroughly to consider its personal claims. Those reporting no benefit are, with one exception, seminaries not represented at the first convention.

IV. RESULTS.

1. *Publication.*—These are meagre. The articles of organization were inserted in a few religious newspapers. An article by a pastor in Michigan, on "The Great Home Field," was published in the New York *Evangelist*, which kindly furnished slips of the article for distribution among the Alliance. A few other articles were inserted in other papers. Regarding publication, the committee found just the reverse of what it expected. The overwhelming flood of articles that was expected from the seminaries did not come. Letters from missionaries and items of missionary intelligence that had been requested did not appear. Thus we are obliged to report that our efforts as a publication committee were not entirely successful. To publish the proceedings of this convention in pamphlet form properly belongs to the province of this committee. This has been secured through a Pittsburgh firm under our supervision.

2. *Correspondence.*—Here we report the most tangible results. Besides kindling a fraternal feeling among the members of the Alliance, it has furnished facts and statistics that are of interest and importance not only to the Alliance, but to the whole Christian world. Of the the 133 theological seminaries and schools in the United States reported in the latest Educational Report, (1879), 2 are suspended, 12 are non-evangelical, 17 Roman Catholic, and 102 evangelical; 46 of these 102 are members of the Alliance, and represent 15 denominations. Of this number one has withdrawn—Allegheny (Covenanter)—on purely denominational grounds, and one has been dropped—Knox College (Canada)—through failure to respond to repeated correspondence. To the remaining original 29 there have been added 17 seminaries representing 5 denominations. It is but just to say that the figures regarding the number of seminaries in the United States are misleading. The Alliance represents the large majority of theological students in our country. We have the backbone of theological strength in all evangelical de-

nominations. (L. Kuhlman, of Gettysburg, was a member of the committee making the above report.)

In closing I will quote a portion of the report of the committee on resolutions from the same convention report as the above, so as to give an impress of its fervency and consecration:

"That devout thanks be rendered to God for the kind providence which conducted us hither, and has permitted us to assemble and to continue uninterruptedly in convention; for the gift of the Holy Spirit, whose presence and power we have felt throughout our convention, and for the spirit of harmony and brotherly love which has pervaded all our sessions.

That we have a profound sense of the advantages we have derived from this convention; that the eloquent addresses and animated discussions have impressed us, as we have not been impressed before, and have given us new ardor to enlist ourselves in a work so mighty and so promising; that the stirring appeals of those who have, even during this convention, pledged themselves to the work of missions have led each of us to examine more carefully our own individual duty in this direction; that the meeting together of so many brethren, of different denominations and from different states, has inspired us with a more catholic spirit, and has shown us more fully that we are members of one common brotherhood, engaged in the one common cause of evangelizing the world.

That the view afforded us of the present state of Protestant missions causes us 'to thank God and take courage,' while the magnitude of the missionary field, the marvelous manner in which Providence is opening up this field for aggressive missionary effort and the imperative demand for immediative action call for increased activity and liberality on the part of all God's people.

That the members of this Alliance consecrate themselves anew to the work of the Gospel, with full submission to the will of our Master, determining by the grace of God to preach Christ faithfully, at home or abroad, as God may direct, and that we call upon all students for the ministry all over our land to join us in this consecration.

That we urge the importance of this Alliance, and its annual

conventions upon the attention of our theological seminaries; that we solicit the hearty co-operation of other seminaries which have not yet joined the Alliance; that we appeal to our seminaries to send larger delegations to the annual conventions, in order that the interest of the conventions may be augmented and that the value of the Alliance to individual seminaries may be increased by the greater number of those whose missionary enthusiasm shall be kindled at the altars of the convention.

That, in order to give the widest possible scope to the influence of this convention, we deem it of great importance to secure an extensive circulation of the convention report. And, therefore, that earnest effort be made by the members of this convention and urged upon all theological students, to place copies of this report in the hands of pastors and all Christian workers.

That to the multitude of Christian missionaries now laboring in home and foreign fields we extend a cordial greeting and we bid them an earnest 'God speed.' Expressing also our profound sympathy with them in every phase of their trying yet glorious work, our joy at the constantly multiplying evidences of their increasing success, and our promise of all that support and encouragement of which the existence of this Alliance is itself the abundant pledge."

The next annual convention of the Alliance will meet at Oberlin, Ohio, during the latter part of October, 1886.

ARTICLE V.

BOURDALOUE.

By REV. H. H. HALL, A. M., Millersburg, Ohio.

There is an artistry in every calling of life to which a man may constantly have an eye. Louis XIV. aimed to be a king in every sense of the word, and Guizot closes the portion of history relating to his reign with this significant sentence: "In spite of his faults and his numerous and culpable errors, Louis XIV. had lived and died like a king."

The character of Louis had in it a strange mixture of qualities. He was comely in person, pompous and majestic in bearing, yet kind and accessible to his people. He was ambitious, proud, and in all his thoughts and acts himself was everything, yet there always continued to be at bottom of his nature a sincere honesty of purpose. He put immense stress upon mere show. On account of the splendor of his camp and soldiery, his enemies in Europe styled him "the king of reviews." He was remarkable for his follies. It was common, in his time, to say of the young coxcomb, unusually vain and pretentious in gait: "He can strut like the king of France." "Louis Baboon" was Swift's jesting word for Louis Bourbon. And, yet, he had an extraordinary fund of good, practical, common sense. This last attribute, together with his industry won for him his reputation. It is no wonder that when the news of his death reached England it was disputed at the coffee houses, whether the late king was most like Augustus Cæsar or Nero. Taking him all in all, however, he was just and noble in sentiment; he had much that is lovable in character; his reign was a magnificent one, and he was justly entitled to be called Louis the Great.

The mistakes of his government were largely due to his situation. It sometimes happens that a man is compelled by circumstances to adopt a course of action which is sure to be followed by many evils. It was so with Louis XIV. That is why his reign produced enormous quantities of bad and good. The

despotism of his rule he thought was necessary to retrench the excess of "licentiousness, confusion and disorder." And anyone viewing the subject in the light of after events will easily see that he judged right. Sainte-Beuve justifies him in what he declares of the effect of his rule upon the writers of his age. He says, there "would have been a freer literature in every sense than that which flourished under Louis XIV., and the eighteenth century would have been partially anticipated." "The young king came, and he brought along with him, he inspired his young literature; he applied the proper corrective to the old, and, saving some brilliant exceptions, he impressed upon the mass of the productions of his time a solid, and finally a moral character which is also that which reigns in his own writings and the habit of his thought."

The sufferings of the people were great and terrible. Multitudes were reduced to beggary. Fifteen hundred thousand were driven by the persecutions of the monarch into disgrace, despair and exile. Indeed few reigns have been productive of more wretchedness and misery than that of Louis XIV.; and when he died the state entered at last upon a long and dreadful agony which ended in the revolution. Yet, notwithstanding, there never was a more brilliant era of literature and art, politics and oratory. Splendid "buildments" under the supervision of that distinguished architect Perrault were planned and erected. Among painters were Le Poussin, Claude Lorrain, Lesuere and Lebrun. Colbert was the excellent minister of finance and Louvois of war. The names of illustrious poets and writers, and a brief account of them would fill a volume. There was "the great Corneille," Moliere, the equal of any writer of comedy in any age, the beautiful and tender Racine, De Retz, Fontaine, Boileau, "the monarch of literary criticism," the accomplished Pascal, Malebranche, the eccentric Mezerri who always sat by a burning candle even in the brightest day light, Madame Dacier who "though she was the most learned woman in Europe, yet her great learning did not alter her genteel air in conversation, or in the least appear in her discourse, which was easy, modest, and nothing affected," Madame de Sevigne, whose admirable letters give such lively pictures of her times and co-

temporaries, and many others. And of churchmen were Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Fenelon and Massillon.

Louis XIV. was not remarkable for intellect. He had little knowledge of letters and his early education was sadly neglected. It was more in his natural gift of good judgment, and his conscientiousness, which was back of what he wrote and said, that his excellence consisted. Montesquieu says: His soul was greater than his mind." But, while he was himself illiterate, he was the patron of scholars. Encouraged and sustained by Colbert, who had a high appreciation of learning, he gave pensions to the eminent literary men of Europe, and so distinguished his age more than any of all times for its gifted men and women.

The fact that the reign of Louis XIV. was so celebrated for great and powerful ecclesiastics very naturally suggests an inquiry as to the conditions under which eloquence flourishes most. It has been thought by a few writers that a free state alone makes the highest efforts of genius possible. There is no doubt but that liberty fills a man with hopes and aspirations which despotism only destroys. It affords him an opportunity to do his best. It expands and inspires; it loosens bound and latent energies and gives them speech and action. Slavery limits, binds, depresses. But it is not true that eloquence is confined alone to a state of freedom. On the other hand the desperateness of a man's situation often awakens every talent that is in him. The past has numerous instances of orators to whom oppression gave the golden tongue with which they won liberty for themselves and their native land. And surely the rule of Louis XIV. would have crushed out every vestige of oratorical genius. His government was more than arbitrary—it was Asiatic. Guizot declares that it is impossible to tell of anything in his time without referring constantly to Louis XIV. The monarch presents the character of his reign in his own words: "I resolved from the first not to leave to another the functions of king whilst I had nothing but the title." "I am the state" was his famous saying. He even undertook to rule the consciences of his people. Edict, custom, the personal wish and preference of others were nothing. It was complained that

pope, council, church, or anything you please in religion, was sacrificed to his pride, and that in France there was no law but "The king willeth it."

Nor will it suffice to say that eloquence was confined alone to the clergy; and, still more, that the remarkable men were Catholics, of which church Louis was himself a votary.* Protestantism had its orators too. There were Jurieu and Bastide, both of whom had great learning and rare ability. John Claude was eminent for masterly eloquence and a man whom even Bossuet with all his insinuating charms could not overcome in debate. Peter du Bosy addressed the king in behalf of his oppressed brothers in the faith. Louis listened to him kindly, and when he had finished remarked: "That is the finest speaker in my kingdom." Other Protestant preachers in France were distinguished for their powers in the pulpit. There is this, however, to be said, pulpit eloquence differs from every other, in the gravity, dignity and importance of its subjects. These are ever the same—God, eternity, the reformation of the individual—and naturally more liberty would be allowed to those who discuss such themes than to orators of any other kind. Then, again, the preacher need not necessarily come in conflict with the reigning power.

In spite of what may be said, by way of explanation, history proves that eloquence is a plant which grows in all soils and conditions. Ireland has always had her orators. England and France and Germany have ever had theirs. Sparta and Athens, Italy, Hungary and the American colonies, had those who spoke divinely for their liberties. Even at the South, while slavery yet existed, there were most remarkable instances of this sort of genius among the negroes. America is called a nation of orators. So that the only certain difference one is able to discover in favor of the free States, in the matter of eloquence, is numbers—quantity, but not quality.

Thus much it seems necessary to say introductory to a brief study of the most remarkable and greatest French preachers.

Louis Bourdaloue was born at Bourges in 1632. There are still in his native town a number of celebrated and ancient buildings. Of these is the cathedral of St. Etienne, as famous as

any in France; in the church of St. Pierre is the tomb of the wife of Louis XII.; the Hotel de Ville was once the private mansion of Jacques Cœur, and for various other reasons, this city occupies an interesting and important place in the history of the country.

Early in life, Bourdaloue joined himself to the Jesuits and was eminent in their college at Bourges, as a professor of rhetoric, philosophy and moral theology. He distinguished himself as a preacher, first, in the country churches, where he acquired so great a reputation that his superiors decided to send him to Paris. Thither he went in 1669, and at once became the favorite, in which high estimation he was held for twenty years. Louis XIV. often invited him to Versailles to preach.

Bourdaloue had remarkable force and energy of character. In the requirements of religion he was exacting and stern, and laxity of faith, or life, was sure to excite his opposition and call forth from him a severe rebuke. His hatred of Pascal, the author of the "Provincials," may be cited as an instance of the intolerance which belongs to a nature so rigid as was Bourdaloue's.

He had a high sense of the greatness and dignity of the ministerial office. The artistry of which mention has already been made, belongs also to this sacred calling; and if Louis XIV. was a king in every sense, Bourdaloue was in every sense a preacher. There was upon his part no catering to power, or such as were in authority. Convinced that he was sent upon a divine mission, he delivered his message accordingly. In the presentation of truth, he was unflinching and favored no man. He made no qualification or abatement even in favor of the *Grand Monarque*. The French court was extremely dissolute and corrupt. "Nothing is rarer," wrote one, "than Christian faith; there is no longer any vice here of which one is ashamed; and if the king were to punish all those who become guilty of the greatest vices, he would no longer have about him nobles, princes or servants; there would not be even a house in France which would not be in mourning." Besides, there was established, by Louis, a strict system of etiquette, consisting of the most absurd and ridiculous flattery. For instance: "The king

needs only to set a day for a review, or hunting party, and it never fails to be cloudless." The forms of civility were so troublesome, and the conversation so cumbrous with ceremony, that language was robbed of all beauty and sense. Well, when a preacher boldly rebukes such a court, or stands up and regardless of all rules of fashion, declares in such a presence the gospel without compromise, it is because he is both genuine in character and true to his grand trust. The king, however, had sense enough to see, and honesty enough to admit, that Bourdaloue was right. In reply to a licentious courtier who criticised the preacher for his severity, he said: "He has done his duty, now let us do ours."

As compared with the distinguished churchmen with whom Bourdaloue shared the ecclesiastical glory of his time, there is some difference of opinion. The French critics gave him the preference for solidity and careful, close reasoning. Boileau pronounced him a more perfect orator than Massillon. There are professional men also, who, after a thorough study of these clergymen, likewise decide in favor of Bourdaloue as to the entire arrangement and plan of his discourses. His enthusiastic admirers became more numerous in a short time than those of Bossuet. Sainte-Beuve remarks: "There is no doubt that if Bossuet had continued in the sermonizing career, which he followed from 1661 to 1669, he would not have kept the sceptre, and that Bourdaloue would have come in the general estimation only after and a little below him."

A brief view of the French pulpit will doubtless be helpful to a juster and more correct notion of Bourdaloue as a preacher. It is upon the side of a people's genius and character that they are influenced most. Hence it is very natural to suppose that this very thing affects both language and the orator. Such has ever been the case in France. The character of that people is impulsive and unstable. It was upon this fact that a French writer based his remark: "Everything happens in France." It turns out, therefore, that their preachers have beauty and imagination but lack coherence. They are warm and elevated, bold in figure, but wanting in strength. They aim at ornament rather than substance. An English writer on rhetoric and belles let-

tres makes a good presentation of the subject in a comparison of the French sermon with that of his own country. He says: "A French sermon is for most part a warm, animated exhortation; an English one is a piece of cool, instructive reasoning. The French preachers address themselves chiefly to the imagination and the passions; the English almost solely to the understanding. A French sermon would sound in our ears as a florid, and often, as an enthusiastic harangue. The censure which, in fact, the French critics pass on the English preachers is, that they are philosophers and logicians, but not orators. It is the union of these two kinds of composition, of the French earnestness and warmth, with the English accuracy and reason, that would form according to my idea the model of a perfect sermon." The style of Bourdaloue was somewhat after the ideal of this author. He wanted imagination and pathos, though he had great earnestness and piety. He had verbosity which was characteristic of the French orator, but he had depth and fervor and good sense and excellent reasoning. The theatrical manner of the pulpit, in his day, he reformed and made it more grave and simple and direct. His division on the words, "My peace I give unto you," has been greatly admired, and reveals something as to his methods. "Peace," he declares, "first to the understanding, by submission to faith; secondly, to the heart, by submission to the law." Bourdaloue's sermons were translated into many foreign languages.

The king was seized with the desire of bringing all his subjects over to the Catholic faith, and with that view sent Bourdaloue to Languedoc. That province, like Poitou and others, was infected with the "heresy," which had steadily been extending itself over Europe and was daily gaining more and more influence and strength. Its inhabitants were mainly laborers and artisans, but thoughtful, and when they had once tasted of the new wisdom would not easily be turned back to the old way. Louis did not profit by the experiences of his grand-father Henry IV., and of Richelieu, both of whom had made most strenuous efforts to accomplish the same end. The "powerful dialectician" did not meet with any signal success. The tide of a freer thought and of an individual sovereignty, in matters of

religion, had fully set in, and there was no power in the world, not even that of Louis XIV. could stay its progress.

The latter portion of his life Bourdaloue devoted to charity, visiting the sick and the prisons. He died May 13, 1704. Louis had in his service a man of abilities in war—Marshal Luxembourg. But while he was a good general, he was utterly without shame—"more corrupt than his age." His private life was such that it has almost obliterated his fame. His death, though, was distinguished like that of some others in his day, by devoutness and a pious turning to the Lord. Bourdaloue had said: "I haven't lived like M. de Luxembourg, but I should like to die like him." He died just as one might expect of so austere a man, "impressed with the miserable insufficiency of human efforts," and uttering these, his last words: "My God, I have wasted life, it is just that thou recall it."

ARTICLE VI.

THE EFFORT TO RECONSTRUCT HISTORY IN THE INTEREST OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL.

By M. VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

The necessity for this article is to be regretted. To write it gives no pleasure but the satisfaction of vindicating truth and justice. Notwithstanding Dr. Spaeth's address on the organization and work of the General Council, with its unfair and misleading statements concerning the General Synod, was taken up by the Philadelphia Pastoral Association and endorsed for wide and varied circulation, it was for a long time allowed to pass without any particular notice. Various reasons might be given for this. It was felt that the representations were too manifestly in conflict with the recorded facts to gain any extended credit as real history. In the strong desire, also, to cultivate peace between the different bodies of our unhappily divided Church, there was a disposition to bear the wrong in silence, if the silence should not be interpreted as a consent to the correctness of the offensive representations. It was hoped that the spirit of

forbearance might have exercise in the case without detriment to the truth of history. But during all this time frequent evidences were observable of a purpose, on the part of the adherents of the General Council, to accept the false account given in that address and to hold the General Synod in the dishonoring light in which it was meant to place it. The zeal of the Pastoral Association seems to have had this aim in view. The papers of the Council indulged in all sorts of ugly paragraphs about the assumed un-Lutheran character of the General Synod, interspersed with patronizing impertinences concerning theological improvement here and there discoverable, supposed to authorize hope of better things in the future. A great many bitter things have been printed which would never have been written were the writers as good as they ought to be or half as wise as they think themselves. It seemed to be thought that the General Synod was beginning to be conscious of its un-Lutheran position and getting ready to accept that of those who a few years ago adopted "The Fundamental Principles." The *Lutheran Observer's* recent reminder of many of the facts in the case, repelling some of the gratuitous aspersions of the address, has been made the occasion of multiplied outbursts of surprise and petty impatience, explicable only on the supposition that to the minds of those manifesting them, the Lutheran standing of the General Synod had been put beyond defense and that of the Council beyond criticism. And the last number of *The Lutheran Church Review* comes to us with a study of "the Causes leading to the organization of the General Council"—an article of no account whatever except as a sign of the working of the misleading influence—in which Dr. Spaeth's misrepresentations are assumed as historically established, and are confessedly made the writer's guide in discussing the subject. The necessity is thus forced on the friends of the General Synod to expose this attempted perversion of history and vindicate the truth against the misstatements sought to be substituted for the facts. Silence is no longer allowable.

The sum and substance of the representation by which Dr. Spaeth has sought the aim of his address, the focal point where he has endeavored to make all the rays of his account burn de-

structively against the General Synod, is the claim that the Synod of Pennsylvania withdrew from that body on account of its doctrinal position. To this all other allegations are made subordinate and tributary. The secession which was followed by the organization of the Council is alleged to have been the result of dissatisfaction with the General Synod's relations to the Confessions of the Church, and required by its persistent and growing un-Lutheranism. The whole series of preceding events is marshalled to point to a doctrinal necessity for the separation. "The long-continued and far-reaching conflict," it is declared, was one "in which the great principle of all true unity of Church and confession was at stake." "The attempt has been made repeatedly," says Dr. Spaeth, "on the part of the friends of the General Synod, to show that the breach at Fort Wayne took place not at all for the sake of the Confession, but simply on a point of order, and perhaps even as a result of personal feelings." He quotes Dr. Waither as correctly giving it the more imposing significance of a protest against the General Synod's departure from the true faith, and adds: "Any one willing to read the history of those days with an unprejudiced eye must come to the conclusion that the great battle was not fought for a mere technicality, but for a principle of the highest importance."

This gratuitous assumption is treated throughout as presenting the real fact in the case. From the coloring thus found the entire picture of the General Synod is drawn—a picture about as unlike the reality as misconception or prejudice could paint it. One bitter charge after another is thrust forward to intensify the exhibit of its perverse and aggravated unfaithfulness to the Lutheran name and doctrine and its invincible hostility to the Confessions. Upon it is thrown the entire blame of the necessary secession. All this is set in the portraiture over against finely drawn delineations of the Pennsylvania Synod's noble efforts and blessed influence in the interest of sound and consistent Lutheran teaching and practice, continued with great patience, till at last, as the only way to save true Lutheranism and secure a right development of the Church, the constantly deteriorating

and hopelessly un-Lutheran General Synod, like a misshapen and rotten ship, had to be abandoned.

It is not indeed surprising that in the calmer times which came after the "breach at Fort Wayne" and the consequent division of the Church, the actors in the divisive movement would wish for some worthier grounds for its justification in the eyes of Christendom and after generations than the asserted wrong of a parliamentary ruling which postponed the reception of the Pennsylvania Synod's delegates till after the General Synod's organization. It was no easy task to magnify that 'ruling,' with all that belonged to it, into an importance that could vindicate the extreme act of disrupting the general body in which Providence had largely united our Church for its earnest work in this country. The difficulty has been increasing year by year as time separates us further from the passions of that occasion, and the adherents of the General Council seem to feel a growing uncomfortableness in looking on that valiant withdrawal from the General Synod as brought about by a conflict on a parliamentary ruling, pivoted on a question of a Synod's right, involved in a point of order. It certainly would be more pleasant to think of it as a protest against departure from the true faith, an heroic faithfulness to the confessional basis of the Church, "a principle of the highest importance." This would put the Council's pedigree in a grander and more inspiring light. The inclination of its friends to take the suggestion and look at it in that light is altogether natural. And no person can justly find fault with all fair effort to exalt the body to which they belong. They are entitled to think as well of it as possible, to vindicate its position, and to set forth its merits and work in their best light. But whatever excuses for its existence they may find in the circumstances of its origin, or however they may admire its "fundamental principles" or rejoice in the mission they suppose it to be accomplishing, there is one thing which they are not entitled to do, and cannot be permitted to do without exposure of the misrepresentation and wrong—to credit, as the present attempt has been doing, the Pennsylvania Synod's separation, leading to the division of the Church in the formation of the Council, to dissatisfaction with the General

Synod's doctrinal basis or relation to our Church's Confessions, thus dishonoring this body by charging the disruption upon its un-Lutheran character.

To show the complete misrepresentation in this charge, it would be quite sufficient simply to quote the clear and repeated declarations of the Pennsylvania Synod itself. Dr. Spaeth, and those who are concurring with him in this attempted new version of the history of the case, are contradicted and confuted by the recorded testimony of the actors in the events; but to cover the whole misrepresentation it is best to recall some of the earlier facts.

1. To the General Synod is due the credit of inaugurating the recovery of our Church in this country to a proper acknowledgment of the Confessions of the Church. Dr. Spaeth's account of the general defection, in the earlier decades of this century, from the confessional recognition which marked the habits of the patriarchs of American Lutheranism, has unfortunately too much of truth in it. But the picture is much overdrawn. Only a narrow and bigoted exclusivism, which can see no Christianity outside of its circumscribing dogmatism, could speak of the religious life of our Church of that period as is done in that account. Despite that defection, the piety and earnest church life of the period were far superior to much that was seen in some places where the "pure doctrine" was gloried in. Yet the confessional standpoint of our Church was, at that time, to a great degree, most sadly abandoned or relaxed. And it is to be specially remembered—a fact which Dr. Spaeth treats with silence—that in few places was the defection more marked and general than in the Synod of Pennsylvania. Not only were its congregations so averse to being bound to any Church authority as to lead the Ministerium to abandon, in 1823, its place in the General Synod which it had helped to organize, but the clergy themselves were prevailing of non-confessional mind. They steadily declined to bind themselves even to the Augsburg Confession. Dr. Jacobs, in "Lutheran Diet" 1877, tells us that the Tennessee Synod, which had formally bound itself to the Confession, "*sent for consecutive years to the Ministerium of Pennsylvania formidable documents, challenging its Lutheranism, which the*

latter passed by in silence."* Dr. Spaeth should have put the picture of these repeated scenes in the Ministerium over against the scene he so graphically paints of Rev. Wyneken's failure of success on the floor of the General Synod in Philadelphia in 1845. The New York Ministerium, which withdrew from the General Synod after the first meeting in 1821 and returned only in 1837, was exceedingly lax on the question of distinctive Lutheranism and ready to break down all barriers between the English Lutheran and Episcopal Churches.† But this was quite equaled by the Synod of Pennsylvania in its formal proposal, in 1819, to unite with the German Reformed Church in the joint establishment of a common theological seminary for the two denominations, and its appointment of a committee, in 1822, under a resolution unanimously adopted, "to deliberate in the fear of God on the propriety of a proposition for a general union of our Church in this country with the Evangelical Reformed Church, and also on the possibility and most suitable method of carrying this resolution into effect."‡ It is pertinent to ask here, why Dr. Spaeth did not entertain his hearers and readers with these facts illustrating the Pennsylvania Ministerium's position, in connection with his pointing out the discreditable "attitude of the General Synod toward the Lutheran Confession," as indicated in the famous letter to the Evangelical Church in Germany in 1845: "In most of our Church principles we stand on common ground with the Union Church of Germany. The distinctive doctrines which separate the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches we do not consider essential." Was it because he thought that he could use the "attitude" of the General Synod against it more effectively by silence concerning the Ministerium's "attitude?" Or was he afraid of revealing the early and broad source of the trouble which still lingered in the General Synod in 1845? At best, is it fair that he should turn the characteristic confessional defection of the times all over on the devoted head of the General Synod, focusing it for the condemnation and dishonor of the very body that was not responsible

**Lutheran Diet*, 1877, p. 128.

†*Lutheran Diet*, 1877, p. 127.

‡See Minutes of Pa. Synod, for 1819 and 1822.

for the laxness and had formally and actually begun the work of restoration?

For, from the very start in its work the General Synod inaugurated the order of recognizing the Augsburg Confession as the standard of doctrine. In 1825, when the Synod of Pennsylvania, which had then withdrawn from it, was silent about the Confession, even in the form of ordination, the General Synod resolved to establish a Theological Seminary, afterward carried into effect at Gettysburg, in which "shall be taught in the German and English languages, the fundamental doctrines of the sacred Scriptures, *as contained in the Augsburg Confession*."* In 1826 the Seminary went into operation, and the professors' oath, after a declaration of *ex animo* reception of the Holy Scriptures, required him to say: "I believe the Augsburg Confession and the Catechisms of Luther to be a summary and just exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the word of God, * * and I solemnly promise not to teach any thing, which shall appear to me to contradict, or be in any degree more or less remotely inconsistent with the doctrines and principles avowed in this declaration." In the Constitution prepared by the General Synod, in 1829, for District Synods, the rule was adopted to ask, in ordination: "Do you believe that the fundamental doctrines of the word of God are taught in a manner substantially correct in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession."* In view of these facts, what is to be thought of Dr. Spaeth's declaring the early attitude of the General Synod to be that of "indifference to the Confession. It was ignored." Its attitude, as shown by facts, was positive and decided, and greatly in advance of the position of the Pennsylvania Synod. For at that time this Synod was using its Liturgy of 1818, which had no acknowledgment whatever of the Augsburg Confession in its form of ordination. Subsequently, in the Liturgy of 1842, published jointly by the Synods of Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio, it still declined to exact confessional obligation in ordaining to the ministry. In 1853, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania acknowledged "the collective body of the Symbolical Books as the historico-confessioinal

*Minutes of 1825, p. 5.

writings of the evangelical Lutheran Church." But this was a mere synodical resolution which obligated nobody, and merely enjoined it as a duty on ministers and candidates "to make themselves better and more thoroughly acquainted with these venerable documents of the fathers." It was not till 1855, two years after its reunion with the General Synod, that it introduced a pledge to the Confessions into its formula of ordination. Thus it took this Synod all these years to reach, in its synodical capacity and action, a confessional soundness with which the General Synod started in 1825.

In order to appreciate aright this leadership of the General Synod in introducing a return to the true confessional ground of our Church, it must be remembered that it was not organized for doctrinal aims, but for fellowship and coöperation in the great practical work before it in our land. It was carried on in addition to the main service to which its constitution consecrated its labors.

2. With this precedence at the outset, the movement in the General Synod was constantly toward a fuller conformity to the confessional faith of our Church. Most recklessly and in utter contradiction of the well-known facts, Dr. Spaeth affirms: "The development of the General Synod was in the opposite direction, further and further away from the good foundations of the fathers." Every one acquainted with the course of thought and feeling in our Church, knows how utterly baseless is this allegation. Perhaps some palliation of the author's offense in the assertion may be found in the fact that, at the period referred to, he had not yet come to our shores, and knew not whereof he affirmed. But such a plea would rather develop the incongruity of his undertaking to write out for us the 'true inwardness' of this history, and his presumption in asserting such a sweeping calumny out of his ignorance. That the growing tendency to confessional ground, working its way through varied and earnest controversy, revealed the dissentient position of many in clearer and stronger antithesis and intensity, was, of course, true, as this occurs in all cases of conflict between opposing views. But that the aggregate movement in the General Synod was toward, and not away from the "good foundation" of the faith as set

forth in the Augsburg Confession, has been conceded by symbolist and anti-symbolist. One need but look through the volumes of the *EVANGELICAL REVIEW* to see the trend of sentiment among us. Dr. S. S. Schmucker, whose relation to the Definite Platform, or Recension of the Augsburg Confession, would dispose him to discover the increasing defection, if there were any, from the *unaltered* Confession, declared in 1851: "Instead of retrogression, there has been an approximation to the Augsburg Confession in the General Synod, since her foundation. And the alleged recent growth of a more lax system among the members of the General Synod is a gross misrepresentation of the truth, as is well known to those who personally participated in the transactions of that body from the beginning."* This progress is included in the testimony of Dr. Krauth in 1864, just before the first withdrawal of the Pennsylvania Synod's delegation at York: "The General Synod was a declaration on the part of the Lutheran Church in America, that she had no intention of dying or moving—that she liked this western world and meant to live here. And she has lived and waxed stronger and stronger, and the general Synod has been a mighty agent in sustaining and extending her beneficent work, and is destined to see a future which shall eclipse all her glory in the past. Heaven pity the fate of the man who looks upon the General Synod as having been a curse to the Church or an inefficient worker in it—who imagines that Lutheranism would be stronger if the General Synod were weaker, or that truth would be reared upon the ruins of what she has been patiently laboring for nearly forty years to build."†

3. In 1864, just when Dr. Spaeth pretends that the Lutheran character of the body had become hopelessly deteriorated and lost, the General Synod placed itself on clearly unequivocal and full Lutheran basis, by an amendment of its Constitution, inserting an unqualified adoption of the Augsburg Confession, the catholic symbol of historic Lutheranism. If ever there had been a time when a lax or ambiguous mode of subscription

**Lutheran Church in America*, p. 203.

†*Lutheran and Missionary*, March 17, 1864.

to the Confession would have justified dissatisfaction on the part of earnest, true Lutherans or palliated the offense of separating and seeking more positive ground, that time was now gone forever. The General Synod had itself done the work of completing its right relation to the Confession. The Pennsylvania Ministerium, and others who acted with it, as will hereafter be shown, declared themselves fully satisfied. It is a simple fact, made indisputable by the records of the time, that this final step in the General Synod's confessional action, removed all desire to withdraw on account of its doctrinal position, or relation to the standards of the Church.

4. The repeated and solemn declarations of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania itself stand as an absolute and invincible refutation of Dr. Spaeth's great charge. It is, indeed, amazing that with the records of his own synod in his hands he could have undertaken the task of substituting a doctrinal or confessional reason in place of the real one for the "breach at Fort Wayne." The General Synod did not, in dislike of the Ministerium's confessional views, intentionally force the separation, using the expedient of a presidential ruling, nor did the delegation withdraw as a protest against confessional unsoundness. Never did a novelist, from a local or personal fact, weave out of his brain a more complete fiction, than the conclusion our author has framed out of the reported remarks of Dr. S. S. Schmucker in a conversation on the journey to Fort Wayne—making these remarks the accepted evidence that the ruling of Dr. Sprecher was the General Synod's "carefully concerted" expedient to force confessional Lutheranism out of itself. The proceedings of the body are themselves an ample refutation of the gratuitous allegation. Not only were the delegates of the Ministerium repeatedly asked to present their credentials, waiving what might seem to them an irregular organization, but the General Synod exhibited its joy on reaching such action as it expected would be acceptable to the delegation in an exultant singing of the doxology and joining in a prayer of glad thanksgiving. To admit Dr. Spaeth's explanation is to charge arrant hypocrisy on the whole assembled Synod.* The other claim,

*This idea, of an exclusion of the Pennsylvania Synod's delegates be-

that the "great battle" waged there was "not for a mere technicality, but for the sacred principle of confessional Lutheranism, is contradicted by the recorded declarations of the delegates and of the Synod itself. Dr. Spaeth and those who are concurring with him in his impossible version of the matter, are invited to look at these interesting records. They are found mostly in the Report of the Synod's Delegates to Fort Wayne, in an Appendix to the Minutes of 1866, and cover the point at issue in emphatic and reiterated declarations. We italicise the decisive statements.

First, in their account of the matter, they say of the convention of the General Synod at York in 1864, from which the first withdrawal of the Pennsylvania Synod's delegation had taken place on account of the reception of the Franckean Synod:

"After the withdrawal of your delegation, the General Synod, with great unanimity, recommended certain amendments to the District Synods, and also passed certain resolutions, which appeared to indicate an earnest desire, on the part of the remaining delegates of the convention at York, *to stand firmly and faithfully upon the true basis of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and of the General Synod*, and to prevent forever the reception of any Synod which could not and would not stand upon this basis."*

Secondly, the Synod of Pennsylvania in 1865 proceeded to elect delegates to represent it in the meeting of the General Synod to be held at Fort Wayne, thereby expressing its desire and purpose to remain in connection with it; and also adopted a statement of the reason of continuing the connection:

"In so doing the Synod desires it to be distinctly understood that * * it is moved to *maintain its relation to the General Synod from the conviction that by the action of the General Synod subsequent to the withdrawal of our delegation, in the adoption of*

cause of their Lutheranism—"rejected by a professedly Lutheran Synod for being Lutheran"—was ventured by the Synod's Committee which, in 1866, reported on the Report of the Delegates to Fort Wayne. See Minutes, Appendix, p. 22. But it is remarkable that the document on which the committee reported contains not one word of intimation of such an idea. It was, therefore, a contribution by the committee itself, derived, probably, from the same private conversation on the journey to Fort Wayne.

*Appendix, p. 2.

the proposed amendments to the Constitution of the General Synod, the cause of the unity and the purity of our beloved Zion may be promoted."

Concerning the sentiment of the Synod in this election and explanation, the delegates in their Report in 1866 after their return from Fort Wayne, say :

"But they [the delegation that had withdrawn at York] and all their brethren of this body also felt and freely acknowledged at that meeting of Synod, *that the conservative course of the General Synod, after the withdrawal of the Pennsylvania Synod's delegation, removed all disposition to sever the connection of this body with the General Synod, and that it was the duty of the mother Synod that had made such earnest efforts to induce other Synods to unite with the General Synod in 1853, to retain its connection undisturbed, and to labor on in the General Synod, for the welfare of our beloved Evangelical Lutheran Zion in this land.*"*

Further on in their Report, giving the facts of the history, they repeat the declaration of their Synod's satisfaction with the General Synod's confessional position :

"When, therefore, the Synod of Pennsylvania met at Easton in 1865, and the time came for action on the proposed amendments and the election of delegates to the General Synod, the Synod, not for a moment doubting that it was at that time still in connection with the General Synod, *resolved formally and heartily to retain and continue that connection.*"†

The delegates further report that in their "Response" to the request to "waive what might seem to them an irregular organization," they declared to the General Synod itself :

"The course of the General Synod after the departure of the delegation of the Synod of Pennsylvania, in adopting the doctrinal amendments and other resolutions, *had removed all apprehensions that the Synod of Pennsylvania would resolve to sever its connection with the General Synod.*" * * "That it had no thought of separating itself from this body at that time, but looked forward to the approach of the time for election of delegates to the General Synod as a matter of course." "The undersigned declare positively that at the meeting of the Synod of Pennsylvania in 1864 that body not only fully believed that it was still in the General Synod, but *had not the slightest idea of severing that connection.*"‡

*Appendix, p. 2.

†Appendix, p. 3.

‡Appendix, p. 14.

They add that they interpreted to the General Synod the action of their Synod, in 1865, in connection with election of delegates.

"The subsequent conservative churchly action of the General Synod inspired new confidence, and led the Synod of Pennsylvania to retain its old relation undisturbed, hoping thus to promote the cause of the unity and the purity of our Church."

Thirdly, not only do the delegates in this Report, thus attest their own, and their Synod's, cordial satisfaction with the General Synod's confessional position, and declare that they stated this fact on the floor of the General Synod, but they distinctly and clearly give *another* reason for "the breach." They report how they made their remaining and working with the General Synod, according to their Synod's desire, turn upon the rights of their Synod as supposed to be infringed in Dr. Sprecher's parliamentary ruling. Their "Response" makes no less than nine points of complaint, but every one is simply an aspect of the *"unfair and unconstitutional treatment"* involved in that point of order. The ninth point presents the climax in this: *"That during the three days of discussion, the convention has declined to undo the wrong it has done, and to re-instate us in our proper position."**

In reference to the sympathy of some members of the General Synod with the Pennsylvania Synod in this "battle," the Report says:

"Your delegates suggested, that if the brethren desired to show their devotion to the right, they could do so by uniting in a common protest against the unconstitutional proceedings of the so-called General Synod."†

It is worthy of note that all through the account, satisfaction with the constitution of the General Synod is implied in the representation that the wrong complained of and on account of which the delegates withdrew, came to pass only by a violation of that constitution.

The closing statements of the "Response" are most emphatic and conclusive. The decisive moment had come—in which the delegates were to present their ultimatum and state finally the

*Appendix, p. 17.

†Appendix, p. 6.

pivotal interest about which their remaining or departing turned, and they declare :

"We can say with a good conscience that we have not sought division, but have waited for union and are ready to co-operate in the General Synod—provided :

That this body shall now declare that the Synod of Pennsylvania had, as it claimed to have, the constitutional right to be represented before the election of officers and to take part in it, and might now justly claim the right of casting its vote.

If the convention will so declare, we are perfectly willing to waive the right of voting, will acquiesce in the present organization, and will take our seats in this body, equals among equals."

In view of this solemn declaration, what becomes of Dr. Spaeth's assertion concerning the General Synod's amendment of its constitution at York, unqualifiedly adopting the Augsburg Confession : *"But it came too late. The time had passed when disruption could have been prevented?"* Here the testimony is unequivocal, that it was not "too late" even two years later, when, at Fort Wayne, the delegates stood on the floor of the General Synod, declaring their readiness to remain and co-operate in it, taking their seats "equals among equals," on the sole condition of an acknowledgment of the Pennsylvania Synod's supposed constitutional rights as involved in the parliamentary question. Not one word is said in this final and decisive statement, as there had not been a single word or whisper before, about the un-Lutheranism of the General Synod as even a point in contention, to say nothing of the point in the "great battle." Dr. Spaeth's anxiety to have the disruption fixed beyond recall, has led him to antedate it by two whole years and to overlook the recorded reason of it when it did come. If ever there had been any confessional questions as irritants in the relation between the Synod of Pennsylvania and the General Synod, the evidence thus given shows that the confessional question was not at all the one on which the disruption took place.

Fourthly, after the reception of this report of the delegation to Fort Wayne, the action of the Pennsylvania itself, severing its connection with the General Synod, puts the question of synodical rights into the fore-front, and does not undertake to al-

lege the General Synod's confessional basis as the reason of separation. The resolution is:

"That as we have been unjustly deprived of our rights by the late convention of the delegates at Fort Wayne, and thereby excluded by them, and because of the conviction that the task of uniting the conflicting elements in the General Synod has become hopeless, and the purpose for which it was originally formed, has signally failed, we hereby declare our connection with the General Synod dissolved."*

Of the three items in this resolution, it will be observed, not one impeaches the General Synod's Lutheran basis. The first is the one great wrong that had been the monotone of complaint at Fort Wayne. Another is an asserted failure of the purpose for which the General Synod had been formed. When it is remembered that by concession of all—and of none more freely than of the Pennsylvania Synod—its original purpose was not at all doctrinal, but practical, it is seen at once that this item can have no reference to its confessional basis. The other—"that the task of uniting the conflicting elements in the General Synod has become hopeless"—does not charge the blame of this on the confessional basis. It *could* not do so, in face of the Pennsylvania Synod's own reiterated assertions of its being entirely satisfied with that basis, and its wish to remain and "co-operate" on it. The Pennsylvania Synod was itself one of the "elements," but the point of its conflict was made to consist in a question of synodical rights, and the 'hopelessness' came when it, in the passions of the hour, proceeded thus to disrupt the unity. So that even the action of that body in sundering the connection, fails to show any ground for Dr. Spaeth's representations.

Fifthly, No ground is found in the resolution by which the Pennsylvania Synod at the same time appointed the committee to issue the call for the convention which formed the General Council:

"To prepare and issue a fraternal address to all Evangelical Lutheran Synods, ministers and congregations in the United States and Canada, which confess the Unaltered Augsburg Con-

*Appendix to Minutes of Pennsylvania Synod, 1866, p. 23.

fession, inviting them to unite in a convention for the purpose of forming a union of Lutheran Synods."*

Even this resolution, it will be observed, does not impeach the genuineness and adequacy of the General Synod's basis. For, it directs a call to those who "*confess the Unaltered Augsburg Confession*"—nothing more. This is only what the General Synod had done, without qualification, and satisfactorily to the Synod that is now about to issue this call for a new body.

Sixthly, The Call *actually sent out* for the Reading Convention, indicated nothing more than the *Unaltered Augsburg Confession* as the basis of the proposed union. Even in parts of the Call which assailed the General Synod, no intimation was given of any need or intention of adding the binding authority of any other symbol than the "Unaltered Augsburg Confession, on which our Church rests as her unchangeable confessional basis."† The only allegation was that in the General Synod were men whose views and course were not in harmony with the Confession. That is, there were still various unassimilated elements in it. But did not the new body take into itself unassimilated elements? Does not Dr. Spaeth himself tell us of the exceeding caution with which the Council has had to deal with the conflicting views within it? What of the days of earnest and heated debate concerning what some affirm and others deny to be a "divine rule, derived from the word and confessions," as to pulpit and altar fellowship? It, however, ill becomes the members of the General Council, maintaining, as they do, against the still extremer demands of the Missourians, that its own position and principles are 'educational,' and should not be made 'coercive' or 'disciplinary,' to go back of the solemn official confession of the General Synod and the Synods in union with it, and deal with the question of the personal sincerity and consistency of all who belong to these Synods. But wholly apart from this question whether "fundamental principles" or their application should be ever left to act simply educationally, as the General Council has itself maintained, the fact is to be distinctly observed that naturally anxious as the Committee were, in call-

†Proceedings of the Reading Convention, pp. 3, 4.

*Appendix, p. 23.

ing the Reading Convention, to present broader and worthier grounds for the movement to destroy the General Synod than the asserted wrong at Fort Wayne, hitherto the burden of complaint, they did not assert that the confessional basis of the General Synod was not, *per se*, truly or adequately Lutheran, but contented themselves with parading overdrawn assertions of other things, most of which were practically *violations* of its basis and constitution, the responsibility for whose existence and occurrence, in fact, rested back in a state of things which their own Synod had a full share in bringing about. Even the call for the Reading Convention, let it be noted, sent out in the movement to break up, if possible, the General Synod, still recognized its truly Lutheran confessional basis by addressing its invitation, to form a "union of *Lutheran Synods*," to those who did just what the General Synod had already done—"confess the Unaltered Augsburg Confession." There is every reason to think, indeed, that the confessional extreme to which the Convention, six months later, went, in the organization of the General Council, was not publicly contemplated in the invitation, but came to pass under the brilliant and strong leadership of Dr. Krauth, whose Lutheranism was ever surpassing itself—a self-surpassing, however, that by perpetually annulling its own positions, forfeited for his interpretations of true Lutheranism the oracular character so often attributed to them.

The various facts thus put by the evidence beyond doubt are easily summed up. 1. That the General Synod inaugurated and took the lead in the process of restoring the Augsburg Confession to its true confessional authority among us. 2. That the movement in the General Synod was steadily into a better harmony with the Confession—Dr. Spaeth's assertion to the contrary being utterly confuted by the well known facts. 3. That two years before the disruption came at Fort Wayne, the General Synod, by the amendment to its constitution, fixed its confessional position so clear and positive as to fully satisfy the Synods which subsequently withdrew. 4. That the Synod of Pennsylvania itself in 1865 declared itself satisfied, that they elected delegates in evidence of this satisfaction, that its dele-

gates declared, in iterated forms, on the floor of the Synod at Fort Wayne, expressing the feeling of their Synod, in view of the "doctrinal amendments and other resolutions," the desire to "retain its old relation undisturbed" and that the Synod, had "not the slightest idea of severing the connection," that these delegates, in reporting back to their Synod, in 1866, their efforts to carry out the purpose of the Synod to remain in and co-operate with the General Synod, allege not one word placing the issue on the General Synod's confessional unsoundness, but positively and emphatically presenting it as having turned on the question of the Synod's "constitutional right to be represented before the election of officers," that neither the Pennsylvania Synod's resolution severing the connection, nor that appointing the committee to call the Reading Convention, nor the call itself as issued by the Committee, impeaches the adequacy of the General Synod's form of confessional obligation—all together constituting a full and complete disproof of Dr. Spaeth's unwarranted representations.

It is not the purpose of this article to discuss "The Fundamental Principles" adopted at Reading, or to institute any formal comparison between the confessional basis of the General Synod and that of the General Council. Its aim is accomplished in vindicating the truth of history against partisan attempts to distort it, and in recalling some of the unerasibly record facts which forever annul the pretence which offers the supposed un-Lutheran position of the General Synod as the necessitating or even justifying cause of the existence of the General Council. The facts given show that while there were intense and heated conflicts in the Church at the time, on both doctrinal and practical matters, it was just when the basis of union in the General Synod was made satisfactory and the Synod of Pennsylvania had "no thought" of leaving it, that the disruption came—came out of the debated claim of Synodical rights at Fort Wayne. The justifying reasons, if there are any, for the organization of the Council, must be found, if found all, in the state of things as existing only after the disruption—leaving the General Synod's confessional position free of the blame for the schism, as avouched by the recorded testimony of the seceding party itself.

But the circumstances which have necessitated this review of the case, call for a few words more. After the exhaustion of the passionate controversy which attended and followed that unhappy division of our Church, came a period of comparative quiet. A prolonging of the strife was felt to be unseemly and unprofitable. The pressing practical work of the Church summoned away from the contention. The last decade seemed to be one of enlarging church enterprise, and of growing good feeling between the separate general bodies. Congratulations over this improving state of things have been heard from many quarters—interspersed, however, with many uncharitable and unjust remarks, insulting and outraging the amenities which should hold among brethren. But in the comparative calm, the progress of thought and feeling has been into more vital harmony in the common faith and work of our Church. Good feeling and love have begun to flow across the dividing lines. From the General Synod—still true to its constitutional consecration, to apply all its powers toward the prevention of schisms, to be sedulously and incessantly regardful of the circumstances of the times and of every casual rise and progress of unity of sentiment among Christians in order that the blessed opportunities to promote concord and unity may not pass by neglected—came a proposition to the other general bodies using the English language for the preparation of a "Common Service" in the interest of unity and uniformity—the General Synod taking the lead in the suggestion and adoption of this work. The harmonious preparations and unanimous adoption of this "Service" revealed to many how unjustly mistaken were the prejudices which they had been entertaining about the General Synod. Thus, various things have been strengthening hope of better harmony, if not indeed of unification, of our Church in the near future.

But there is reason to fear that these things have been misunderstood. The appearance in the *Lutheran Observer* of editorials criticising the extreme confessionalism of *The Fundamental Principles* of the Council and vindicating the General Synod against the aspersions of Dr. Spaeth's address—an address which broke the growing peace—was met by all sorts of

ill-natured expressions of surprise and disappointment, as though dissent from the Council's position or defense of that of the General Synod was alike no longer looked for. The truce in controversy and the General Synod's readiness to cultivate harmony, fellowship and co-operation, seem to have been mistaken for growing approval of the General Council. All this seems to make it necessary that it be set forth distinctly, so as to be understood once for all, that if the brethren of the Council have taken the sound Lutheranism which they have recognized in the General Synod, and this readiness for fellowship in worship and Church life, as any sign of a weakening of approval of the General Synod's confessional position or of any growing inclination to adopt that of the Council, it is best that the illusion should be at once and thoroughly dissipated. We are fully warranted in saying that it means nothing of the kind. The General Synod has incorporated in its fundamental law a clear and unqualified adoption of "the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that word," and there it proposes to stand. This Confession is the great historic, catholic, characterizing Confession of Lutheranism, the only one universally received as necessary to mark our Church, as every one knows who is acquainted in its history. The addition of the binding confessional authority of the Form of Concord and all the other symbols, in the mode of affirmation in the Council's Fundamental Principles, is a confessional extreme, derived from a movement in a post-reformation day, and marking, not the true catholicity of our Church, but a *particularity*, some places locally enforced, but never its true characteristic. History is full of the strife, discord, bitter conflicts, divisions, and loss to our Church, by the unwise attempts to enforce this 'particularity,' under the rigor of prescriptive confessional obligation. The General Synod, standing on the great Confession which represents the true catholicity, as well as the pure doctrine, of our Church, is firmly persuaded that that restrictive, exclusive, sectarianizing 'particularity' is not the type of Lutheranism which the patriarchs our American Church brought to this country, nor the kind for its true life, work, and success

in our land. If the members of the General Council like that inferior and smaller Lutheranism for themselves, it is their right to have it and to extol it, but the General Synod rightly insists upon the truer, broader Lutheranism of the unsectarianized Reformation period, a Lutheranism catholic enough to hold a Luther and a Melancthon in unbroken fellowship and co-operation, a Lutheranism undiminished by the extremists who could accomplish their restrictive purposes with effect only after the steadying and restraining voice and power of Luther were removed by his death. There always have been those whose imperious dogmatism and intolerant confessionalism, at once most sweeping in scope and minute in rigidly fixing the extremest features of explanation, have tended to diminish or destroy the true catholicity of our great Lutheran Church, and there always have been those who have wisely withstood this tendency. To this greater, larger, richer, genuine Lutheranism of the Augustana, the Confession which, in its 'true and original sense,' stands at once for the catholicity of Christianity and of our Church, the General Synod is devoted; and it is cherished with undiminished loyalty by its members, not because of indifference to Lutheranism, but because of their love for it. This love for it forbids their consent to the astringing and contracting of their Church into the sectarian smallness and exclusiveness which "The Fundamental Principles" of the Council are declared to logically involve and necessitate—an intolerant exclusiveness inconsistent alike with the word of God and the true interpretation of the Confession. They mean—as the Pennsylvania Synod so well put the import of the York amendment—"to stand firmly and faithfully upon the true basis of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and of the General Synod," being thoroughly persuaded that this is the genuine Lutheranism to which belongs the future of our Church in this land.

As the members of the General Synod have not found in the Council a better confessional basis, so they have failed to discover in it a more efficient agency for uniting the scattered tribes of our Church. The hope of union on the basis of this narrow 'particularity,' instead of the true catholicity, of Lutheranism, has not been made inspiring by the General Council's

experience. Dr. Spaeth, indeed, says that "there has never been a serious attempt to controvert the soundness of the doctrinal basis of the General Council." The Dr.'s reading and memory have not served him well in this matter. Does he not know of Dr. Brown's searching analysis of the "Fundamental Principles," showing their absurd logical consequences and their inconsistency with the true Lutheran conception of the place of church confessions? But altogether apart from the question of "serious attempt to controvert the basis" of the union sought to be effected by the Council, has not Dr. Spaeth himself recorded the fact that "Missouri kept aloof from the whole movement?" And he is fully aware that Missouri does not look upon the basis as sufficient, in itself, to insure the full practical application of the Lutheran doctrines. Has he not himself told us also of the Joint Synod of Ohio's declining to come in without further guarantees as to Chiliasm, mixed communion, exchange of pulpits, and unchurchly societies? Has he not mentioned, too, the anomalous attitude of the Synod of Iowa, which the papers have lately informed us is still not ready to come in? Is not the Norwegian-Danish Augustana Synod in like attitude? Have not the Wisconsin Synod, the Synod of Minnesota, and the Synod of Illinois withdrawn? And has not the principle of refusing fellowship and co-operation except on absolute agreement in dogmatic confessionalism and identity of confessional interpretation, lately rent the union of the General Conference, on the question of predestination? The prospect of a union of our Church on this principle has not grown bright. If any thing else has been needed to confirm the devotion of General Synod men to its own catholic basis, it has been furnished by Dr. Jacob's recent long and labored defense of the "Fundamental Principles" in *The Lutheran*—a defense that has its only plausibility in assumptions of the legitimacy and necessity of the intensest sectarian, close-communion, intolerant denominationalism. In the last issue of that paper* he sums up their import in what is substantially a claim, in the face of the whole history of dogmatic and confessional development, that the Church's confession of God's truth is to be held, like the word of God itself, as

*Sept. 23, 1886.

"unchangeable." His confidence in the Council's mode of binding to the whole Book of Concord is so great that he confidently predicts the General Synod's early adoption of the Council's basis. We believe this prediction has come out of his own abundant admiration for the "Fundamental Principles" and confidence in the force of his own logic in their defense, rather than from anything he knows of the purposes of the General Synod.

The growth of fellowship with the brethren of the General Council, and the readiness to co-operate with them in the adoption of a common order of service and in Church activity, must, therefore, not be misunderstood. The General Synod stands in no exclusive or intolerant attitude. Its catholic Lutheranism puts it in just fellowship with all parts of our Church holding the unaltered Augsburg Confession. The co-operation in preparing the Common Service required no consent to the Council's extreme confessionism, and none has been given. It called for no abandonment of the General Synod's basis. The coöperation took place in full harmony with its catholic Lutheran organization and spirit. It is to be hoped that even the continued unfair and unjust representations of its character, such as that which has called forth this paper, will not be allowed to abate among us this characteristic readiness and effort to promote fellowship and unity in our unhappily divided Church.

ARTICLE VII.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

By PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D., Springfield, O.

The words of the Creed, by which the Church confesses her faith in the COMMUNION OF SAINTS, are of late introduction. Augustine, who wrote a special treatise on Faith and the Creed knows nothing of these words. Prof. Lumby, of Cambridge, gives the date of their use by Eusebius Gallus as 550 (?). Prof. Heurtley holds that they did not find place in the Creed until near the close of the eighth century, since they are not found

in the Creed of Etherius, 785.* Westcott says: "Our Western forefathers added, as late perhaps as the eighth century, a fresh clause to the Creed in order to give clear expression to the characteristic thought, and taught us to declare our belief in *the Communion of Saints*."—*Historic Faith*, p. 123.

The doctrine of the Communion of Saints dwelt in the consciousness of the Church from the very beginning. It is exemplified at Acts 2 : 44, 45, and is taught in those passages which speak of "fellowship" (*κοινωνία*), as "the right hand of fellowship," fellowship of the mystery," "fellowship in the Gospel," "fellowship with one another;" "partakers (*κοινωνοί*) of the altar," "partakers of glory," "partakers of the divine nature;" also, "Ye are all one man in Christ." "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all."

Under the persecutions and trials which the Church endured in the earlier centuries of her history, this doctrine must have afforded strong consolation to the saints, viz.: that they had fellowship with each other, and were common partakers of the blessings of redemption. This doctrine, so precious and so full of comfort and inspiration, the saints, it is natural to conclude, would seek to embody in some brief and comprehensive formula which could take its place in the Creed alongside of "Remission of Sins," "Life everlasting," &c. But what the particular circumstances were which led to this addition to the Creed cannot now be ascertained. Usually creeds are prepared or enlarged for the purpose of meeting prevalent or encroaching heresy, and for the purpose of stating what is the faith of the Church at that

*"This clause which does not occur in any of the formularies of the Eastern Church, was one of the latest additions to the Western Creed. St. Augustine was ignorant of it, for he says in his *Enchiridion*: 'Post commemorationem Sanctae Ecclesiae, in ordine Confessionis, ponitur Remissio Peccatorum.' C. LXIV; and in *Serm. C. CXIII*, 'Cum dixerimus 'Sanctam Ecclesiam,' adjungimus 'Remissionem peccatorum.'"

"We first meet with the clause in one of the Creeds expounded by Eusebius Gallus, (XXX).

After a longer interval it occurs again in one of the Creeds of the *Codex Bobiensis*, XXVIII. It is still wanting in the Creed of Etherius, A. D. 785 XX-XII. It can hardly therefore be considered as established before the close of the eighth century." Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 145.

time. In accordance with this idea Lord King in his Critical History of the Creed, supposes that the words, *Communio Sanctorum*, were added in order to meet the Donatistic heresy, and that in so far they signify principally two things: "First, that a sign whereby one knows a true church is, that other churches communicate with it. Secondly, hence also a negative sign, whereby any church which sets up an exclusive claim like the Donatists, thereby unchurches itself." This opinion is accepted by J. G. Walch, *Introd. in Lib. Sym.*, p. 99; also by Wilson in *Bampton Lectures* for 1851, p. 7. One sufficient reason for rejecting this opinion is, that it requires us to assume the introduction of these words into the Creed from one to three centuries earlier than the date now fixed by the most trustworthy scholarship, since Donatism rapidly declined after the first quarter of the fifth century, and ceased to have any considerable influence by the beginning of the sixth century.

Some have thought that the words in question came into the Creed through the catechetical exposition-praxis, as explaining the meaning of *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*. This opinion lacks historical confirmation.

Failing therefore to ascertain the exact time and the circumstances which introduced these words into the Creed, a more important question is, What do they mean? Lord King thinks that on the whole they were added to declare that true churches ought to have communion and fellowship with each other. Wilson, *Bampton Lectures*, 1851, p. 14, says, "When the clause is first found, although not in an authorized and public way, it is expounded, not in reference to the general community of interests which belong to Christian people, but in regard to supposed particular relations between the living saints and the dead. It may be true, that, to use the words of Bishop Pearson, 'they which first found this part of the article in the Creed, and delivered their exposition unto us, have made no greater enlargement of this communion as to the saints in heaven, than the society of hope, esteem and imitation, on the one side, of desires and supplications on their side.' But as other opinions grew up, they clustered round and appropriated a term which did not

originally belong to those subjects, which belonged originally to the department of discipline rather than to that of theology."*

Luther, *Large Catechism*, Art. III., OF THE CREED, says: "The holy Christian Church the Creed denominates a communion of saints (*communione sanctorum*), for both expressions are taken together as one idea. * * Also the word *communio*, which is added, ought not to be communion (*Gemeinschaft*),† but congregation (*Gemeine*). And it is nothing else than an interpretation whereby some one meant to explain what the Christian Church is."‡

Here arise three questions: First, was this addition made to the Creed in order to explain what the Christian Church is? Let it suffice to say that neither King, nor Pearson, nor Heurtley,§ nor Wilson, nor Lumby, has made any such discovery.

*"The following are the chief meanings and employments of the word communion. Temporal and spiritual communion; ecclesiastical and lay; communion of fraternity, as between bishops; communion of his people, when a bishop held no communion with other bishops, 'contentus sit communione plebis suae;' ordinary communion; foreign communion, in two senses: 1. of strangers or visitors; 2. a depression of ecclesiastics to lay-communion so-called; communion of sacraments; communion of the altar; communion with oblations or without oblations, referring to different stages of penitents; communion by oblation of name; communion by salutation or benediction; communion by letters; communion by commemoration as in the 'communicantes;' communion of saints between the living and the dead; between the Church militant and the Church triumphant."—Wilson, *ut supra*.

†In the *Agende* of the Pennsylvania Synod, 1786, *Gemeinschaft* is used, and not *Gemeine*. Also in the Darmstadt Catechism, 1783. Also in Henkel's Catechism (New Market) 1811.

‡Book of Concord (Jacobs), pp. 444-5. See German and Latin.

§"Different views have been taken of the meaning of the clause. It is important to notice that the earliest commentators, that one in the number in whose sermons we first meet with it, understood it especially of the communion which the saints on earth have with the saints departed. '*Sanctorum Communione*: Sed sanctos non tam pro Dei parte quam pro Dei honore veneramus. Non sunt sancti pars Illius, sed Ille probatur pars esse sanctorum. * * Colamus in sanctis timorem et amorem Dei, non divinitatem Dei. Colamus merita, non quae de proprio habent, sed quae accipere pro devotione meruerunt. Digne itaque venerandi sunt, dum Dei nobis cultum et futurae vitae desiderium contemptu mortis insinuant.'—Eusebius Gallus, Hom. 2.

No one of these original investigators mentions this as the reason for the introduction of this clause into the Creed. We are compelled therefore, on the authority of the highest historical and theological scholarship, to surrender this opinion of Luther, as long ago we were compelled to surrender the judgment of all the reformers in regard to the true apostolic authorship of the Creed, and that of the dogmaticians on the inspiration of the Hebrew vowel-points.

'Sanctorum communionem: id est cum illis sanctis qui in hac quam suscepimus fide defuncti sunt societate et spei communione teneamur.'—Serm. CC—XLII., alias De Tempore, C XXXI., among the sermons falsely ascribed to St. Augustine. Opera. Tom. V.—Heurtley *Harm. Sym.*, p. 146.

The oldest explanation which I have been able to find dates from Nicetas (454–485) who says: *Ecclesia, quid aliud quam sanctorum omnium congregatio? Ab exordio enim sancti—Justi—una ecclesia sunt, quia una fide et conversatione sanctificati.—Ergo in hac una sancta ecclesia crede te communionem consecuturum sanctorum.* See Herzog, *Real-Encyc.* From this it is very evident that *communio sanctorum* is not equivalent to *una ecclesia*, but is a good found in the one Church, as explained by Nicetas in his Exposition of the Faith.

According to Caspari, Faustus of Gaul in the fifth century gives the following explanation: *Ut transeamus ad sanctorum communionem. Illos hic sententia ista confundit, qui sanctorum et amicorum Dei cineres non in honore debere esse blasphemant, qui beatorum martyrum gloriosam memoriam sacrarum reverentia monumentorum colendam esse non credunt.* Thus Nicetas and Faustus living before the words became fixed in the Creed may be regarded as authentic interpreters. That is, the idea given by these and other ancient interpreters, so far as we can discover, is uniformly that of *communion between the real saints*, and not that of didactic equivalence to Holy Catholic Church. In mediæval times this doctrine of real communion between the saints was limited mainly, perhaps wholly, to that between saints on earth and the saints in heaven. Bellarmine says: "*Communio sanctorum, extra hanc vitam invocandorum.*" Against this now one-sided, exaggerated, vulgarized, idolatrous idea, the Reformation was such a protest as really depressed for awhile the proper idea of communion to a degree that almost took away the basis of the article; and hence it was treated as by Luther, Gerhard, and others, as expegetical of the preceding article. We are now returning to the original, fundamental meaning of the article, without its earlier limitation and subsequent idolatry; that is, we are confessing a communion of all the saints, but we do not invoke the saints.

Are the terms, Holy Christian* (catholic) Church and Communion of Saints, the perfect equivalents of each other, so that they both comprehend one and the same thing, as the German expresses it? This is the second question.

Luther was doubtless led to this view by his doctrine of the Church in opposition to Rome, which maintained that the Church was an external polity or visible organization, and that visibility and externality are its chief characteristics.† At Leipzig in 1519 Luther declared, "There is one holy universal Church, which is the whole body of the predestinated." Subsequently to this he called the Church simply the *Communion of Saints*. He maintained that wherever the Gospel is preached and the sacraments are administered, there true believers will appear. These alone are the proper members of Christ and have communion with the Holy Ghost and are partakers of all the blessings of Christianity. Therefore the Church is a community, an assemblage, a company of saints, that is, a congre-

*Luther preferred "Christian" to "Catholic," but was not the first to suggest this change. Says John Ebart: "By the word *Christliche* is meant *Catholische*, because the name Christian is spread through the whole world." The Lutheran theologians have not generally followed Luther, but prefer *Catholic*. In this article we use *Catholic*.

†Bellarmin describes the Church as an "assemblage of men bound together by the profession of the same Christian faith and the communion of the same sacraments, under the government of lawful pastors and especially of the Roman pontiff the sole vicar of Christ on earth." He adds: "The Church is as visible and as manifest to the senses as the assemblage of the Roman people, the kingdom of France, or the republic of Venice." Luthardt says, *Dogmatik*, p. 19: "Das Wesen des Romanism, ist die Identificirung des Christenthums mit der äusserlichen, hierarchisch gegliederten, im Primat des röm. Bischofs gipfelnden Kirche, deren Organismus der inspirirte and irrthumslose Trager und Garant der Wahrheit, welchem unterthan zu sein daher die vordeste Pflicht des Christen ist. Die Kirche ist daher nothwendig eine respublica visibilis et palpalilis, die Stellvertreterin Christi des Proph., Hohenpr. und König's, die Forts, seiner Incarnation, die Mittlerin des Heils. Sie zerfällt in eccl. docens et audiens, imperans et obediens. Ihr Wesen ist gesetzslicher, nicht evangelischer Art. Sie ist dem einzelnen gegenüber die höchste richterliche und heilsmitter. Auctorität; der Gehorsam gegen sie so unbedingt, dass es eine Berechtigung der in der Schrift ruhenden Glaubensgewissheit und des Christlichen Gewissens ihr gegenüber schlechterdings nicht gibt."

gation of those who have imputed to them the righteousness of Christ, and are ruled by the Holy Ghost. Luther never would allow any other definition* of the Church, and insisted solely on true faith and the attribute of invisibility.† But is this (*communio sanctorum*) an adequate definition of the historic Holy Catholic Church, that is, does it comprehend *inter terminos* all that the Church herself has comprehended under the words *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, so as fairly to exhaust the idea which these words are intended to convey, and so as to justify me in writing and saying the Creed as follows: "I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins," etc.?

Now why do I say *Credo Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam*? I believe the Church is *Sancta* notwithstanding the sins and shortcomings and positive crimes of many of her members. I believe it because her Head is holy, the Holy Ghost is active in her, her doctrines and institutions are holy, her end is holy, many of her members are holy. These possessions and qualities of the Church cannot be tested by the senses. They are the objects of faith. But they impart a holy character to the Church; an aggregated holiness, such as belonged to the company of the Apostles, of whom Christ said, "Now ye are clean, but not all;" there was Judas who was a devil,—such holiness as belonged to the twelve tribes of Israel, although Korah and his company are among them: "All the congregations are holy together, and the Lord is among them." Why do I believe the Church is *Catholica*? I believe it not mainly because she is

*See Smalcald Art. XII. Also Schwabach Art. XII: "This Church is nothing else but believers in Christ, who with true faith maintain and profess the fore-mentioned articles, and moreover in the world suffer persecution and martyrdom."

†Polycarp Lyser asks the question, "Did Luther define the Church as invisible?" "In discussing that subject [the Church] Luther spoke only of the true and living members of the Church. * * He opposed that proposition to the papal Church which seeks to shine only in external splendor, and maintains that the Church is so bound to this external visible assemblage that he who does not submit to them (pope, cardinals, etc.) cuts himself off from the church. This Luther denied."—*Catechismus Lutheri Latino-Germanicus*.

locally extended *in toto mundo*, and embraces all true believers; but mainly because she has preserved the whole fulness of the divine truth, through which she will ultimately prevail over the entire earth.*

But what as regards *Ecclesia*? *Ecclesia* is not *per se* properly an object of faith. She is an empirical society, a manifest *politia* with rites, ceremonies, laws and institutions,—a veritable reality, a great fact potent to the senses. And so distinctly is this attribute of externality, of empirical quality, impressed upon the Church, that it may be safely said that no definition of the Church is adequate which does not recognize and give due emphasis to this feature.

(a). Such a recognition is required in order to make our idea of the Church agree with the inspired description given by Luke in Acts 2 : 42, "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers"—which shows us the *de facto* Church of Jesus Christ, which consists in the maintenance of apostolic doctrine, in organization, in the use of the sacraments, in public worship. (b). The same recognition of empirical quality is required by the facts of history. The Church in some sense precedes faith as well as requires faith. "The remission of sins" as to substance is a doctrine of the divine word, but "I believe the remission of sins" as to form, is a doctrine of the Church, and it was not until the pious priest, a visible servant of the visible Church, preached this doctrine to Luther that he found peace for his distressed soul. And it is in harmony with the same idea that the Augsburg Confession says, Art. V: "For the obtaining of this faith, the ministry of teaching the Gospel, and administering the sacraments, was instituted," etc., that is, appeal is made to the visible Church.†

(c). The same recognition of external quality is required in order properly to meet fanatics and to avoid at least the *appearance* of Donatism. Hence Luthardt, *Dogmatic*, p. 297, *Edi. septima*, says: "Melancthon in the *Loci* of 1535 and in the

* See Spener's *Tabulae Cat.* Also Wescott's *The Historic Faith*, p. 122.

† It bears on this point that many of the dogmaticians place *De Ministerio Ecclesiastico* before *De Ecclesia*.

improved of 1543, in opposition to the Donatistic and fanatical errors of the Anabaptists, emphasizes more the empirical Church as the necessary place for the essential Church, and defines it therefore, not as *Communio Sanctorum*, but as *Coetus Vocatorum*: 'Whosoever we think of the Church let us look upon the assemblage of the called (coetum vocatorum) which is the visible Church, and let us not dream that there are any elect except in this visible assemblage'—'The visible Church is the assemblage of those who embrace the Gospel of Christ and rightly use the sacraments, in which God operates by the ministry of the word, and regenerates many to eternal life.' Likewise Chemnitz* also emphasizes the empirical Church: 'It must be known to us. Wherefore it is defined as the visible assembly of those who embrace the Gospel of Christ, &c.' "†

Polycarp Lyser, in answer to the question, "What is the Church?" says: "Usually it is thus defined: The Church is the visible assemblage of those who embrace the Gospel of Christ, and rightly use the sacraments, in which (*coetu*) God operates by the

*"It is most certain that the true Church cannot be separated from true doctrine, or the faith. For that is the true Church which embraces and professes the true and sound doctrine of God's word."—*Exam. Trid.*, Ed. Preuss., p. 49.

†See Melancthon's numerous definitions of the Church in his *Corpus Doctrinae*, Lipsiae, 1563. Especially his answer to the question, *Quid sit ecclesia sancta?* p. 897, also to *An sit Visibilis Ecclesia?* p. 899. In the Apology, Chap. IV., he says: "The communion of saints *seems* to be added in order to explain what the Church signifies." I cannot find that he subsequently so employed *communio sanctorum*. See Chemnitz, *Loci, De Ecclesia*, Cap. III: "God wishes us to seek, to know and to understand what and where the true Church is, that we may become members of it and hear it. For it is as a city set upon a hill, as a candle not hid under a bushel, but placed on a candlestick, Matt. 5: 15. Therefore it must be known not only to God who understands secret things, and looks into hearts, but also to us." Compare definitions of the Church in the *Confessio Wirtembergensis*; also the *Confessio Saxonica*. The latter quotes the Creed: *Credo esse Ecclesiam sanctam Catholicam*, and says: "We point out a Church that can be seen and heard." "The Church is a coetus which can be seen and heard." Also Vogel under the head, *Quid et Quae sit Vera, sancta, et Catholica Ecclesia*: "The Church is the coetus of persons embracing the pure word, etc." "This coetus is called the Church catholic."—*Thesaurus Theologicus*.

ministry of the word, and regenerates many unto eternal life. In this assemblage, however, there are many unholy, but they agree in regard to true doctrine."—*Catechismus Lutheri*, p. 83.

It will thus appear how these great theologians of the Church, in the face of error, were forced to bring out and emphasize the empirical quality of the Church. They plainly saw that Luther's definition, a community of saints, emphasized only one side of the idea of the Church, since even the saints themselves are visible persons, and since the entire *coetus vocatorum* taken together has Christianity for its *norm*.* And it was to preserve this empirical quality of the Church that Melancthon invented *Ecclesia large dicta*, which in one form or another is very generally used by the dogmaticians. It is also in the same line of argument that König says, after giving the definition of the Church to be quoted hereafter: "The attributes and adjuncts of the Church are unity, sanctity, catholicity, apostolicity, authority, visibility, splendor, affliction, defectibility." The attributes and adjuncts of what Church? Evidently the *Ecclesia visibilis*, the *coetus vocatorum*, outside of which we are not to look for either *sanctitas* or *catholicismus*. This, it can easily be shown, is the idea which the witnessing confessing Church herself has always understood by *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*—the *coetus visibilis*, whose *sanctitas* and *catholicismus* are believed, for reasons given on a previous page.†

Hence it is only when the dogmaticians define the *invisible* Church that they call it an assemblage or congregation of saints. Thus Hollazius: *Ecclesia stricte, proprie et exquisite dicta est coetus vere credentium et sanctorum*, which is by no means com-

*"The Church as a society asserts unflinchingly the claims of the Gospel though the message may often be the condemnation of those who bear it. The ideal is firmly held forth through all disasters. And this maintenance of a great faith is a power of life. * * The Christian Church, wearied and betrayed by men, does not despair of humanity. By that spirit she vindicates her life. She offers to all without reserve and without doubt the calling to holiness and the assurance that the call can be obeyed."—Westcott, *The Historic Faith*, p. 119, 120.

†This same Church which Chemnitz calls "the true Church," now visible, contains those essential features which shall triumph and abide forever. This we believe.

mensurate, either historically, confessionally or didactically, with the faith of the Church in *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*; for this *Ecclesia invisibilis*, composed of true believers and of persons ruled by the Holy Spirit, is found nowhere (see Melancthon *supra*) except in the visible *coetus*,* which has the word and the sacraments, without which she could not be the *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, for losing these, she would cease to have the notes of the Church, and would cease to have those sole means of grace by which men become true members of the body of Christ. Hence while the definition, the Church is *coetus vere credentium et sanctorum*, is undoubtedly correct in so far as the *invisible* Church, the truly saved, the living members of the body of Christ, are concerned, that is not what is historically and confessionally meant by *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, which has always included and always will include (in the Church militant) the idea of the visible *coetus* outside of which even we Protestants teach that there is ordinarily no forgiveness of sin and no sanctification.—*Book of Concord* (Jacobs), p. 446.

And now should the opinion of Luther be allowed that *communio* means *congregation* (*Gemeine*), the phrase, *Communion of Saints*, could correspond only to the *invisible* part of the Church, that part which has true communion (*κοινωνία*) with Jesus Christ, and is partaker of the Holy Ghost.

In harmony with the foregoing exposition, may be quoted authorized and standard definitions of the Church. In the seventh article of the Confession, we have: "The Church is the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments rightly administered." This definition Melancthon triumphantly defended in the Apology as applying to the essential or *invisible* Church; but he appeals to the eighth article to show that the confessors also maintain a *visible*

*Polycarp Lyser, after defining the Church as quoted on a preceding page, "*Ecclesia est coetus visibilis, etc.*," says: "Quicumque in illo coetu sunt ab impiis segregati et tam imputatione justitiæ Christi, quam spiritus inchoatione sanctificati, illis omnia spiritualia Christi beneficia sunt communia."

Church.† The dogmaticians generally follow the definition of the Confession, and define the Church primarily with reference to the *invisible* features, but they always qualify the definition or expand it so as to include the *visible* Church. For instance König: "Ecclesia Synthetica vel stricte sumitur, pro coetu sanctorum; vel latius and γενικῶς pro coetu vocatorum promiscuo."

†"In the *seventh* article the pious confessors declare that the one holy Church shall abide forever, or that the Church is the congregation of saints. But when they add that in this Church which is the congregation of saints, the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered, the impression is at once made, that the invisible Church which will abide forever, since it is the congregation of saints, is joined with (confundatur) the visible Church, which also is the true Church, a characteristic of which is that in it the word of God is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered. Wherefore Valentinus Alberti in *Augustana Confessione*, etc., Cap. X., p. 302, observes that in this article the Confession speaks of the Church in so far as it signifies Coetum fidelium, but in such a way that it must be regarded in a double sense: First, as regards essence, in which sense the one holy Church shall abide forever; but in this sense it exists invisible. Secondly, as regards the principal adjuncts, namely, true doctrine and public worship, in which sense it is visible, but will not abide forever. Interpreters have resorted to different methods of reconciling these words of the Confession. Besides others we mention Jo. Trid. Walliserus. It is self-evident that the Confessors speak principally of the invisible Church, as is shown by what they have said in the Apology. But at the same time they considered this invisible Church in so far as it is visible, though not wholly so, since it is scattered through the whole world, yet at least a certain part is visible. But that they may indicate a mark of the true visible Church, they add, that in it the divine word is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered. They seem to have joined the two ideas for the purpose of satisfying the objection of the papists and of refuting the error of others. * * Others think that our forefathers opposed themselves to the Romanists because they (the Romanists) would admit only the external Church, in order that with the better grace they might apply to the Romish Church the praises and promises which belong only to the invisible Church. Although indeed the difference between the invisible and the visible Church must not be understood as though there are two kinds of Church, one of which is visible, the other invisible; but there is only the one and that the true Church, which from different points of view may be called both visible and invisible. The confessors wished to indicate a note or mark by which it could be known, whether a certain Church, if it be considered as visible, be true and pure." *Walch's Introduc.*, p. 279, et seq.

But his final definition of the Church, is: "*The Synthetic Church is the mixed assemblage of persons called by the ministry of the word to the kingdom of God and to the participation of spiritual and heavenly blessings, and agreeing in the outward profession of the true doctrine.*"*

John Ebart, in his *Enchiridion Theologicum*, honored with a preface by Dr. Christian Chemnitz, says, p. 475, "We do not deny that the true Church is visible; but we do not concede that it is purely and *per omnia* visible." Quenstedt, *De Ecclesia*, Sec. I., V, says: "The Synthetic Church is taken, I., broadly and generically for the common assemblage of all the called, who use the preaching of the word and the sacraments; II., strictly and specifically for the assemblage of the saints or of believers embraced in the general congregation." Such definitions of the Church are a fair sample of those given generally by the dogmatists, not one of whom has ever ventured to give so broad a definition of *Communio Sanctorum*, which, upon the assumption of Luther that Holy Catholic Church and *Communio Sanctorum* are the exact equivalents of each other, they would be justified in doing, according to the axiom that things which are equal to each other are each equal to the same thing. On the contrary in all the definitions given by the dogmatists (examined by us) *Communio Sanctorum* is less extensive than *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, and is confined wholly to participation in the blessings of redemption. Moreover, they use the word *Sanctorum* as pertaining wholly to those who are truly sanctified, that is, have the righteousness of Christ imputed to them and are ruled by the Holy Ghost; whereas no such exclusive sense attaches to *Sancta* as applied to *Ecclesia*.†

* *Theologia Positiva*, p. 278. See same definition in Quenstedt, *De Eccl.*, Sec. I., XXI.

† According to Rufinus the ancients interpreted the holiness which the Creed imputes to the Church, of purity and holiness of doctrine. Dixon and Smith in Church Catechism (Episcopal) make a clear distinction between "the true saints" and "the Church of Christ [which] is a collection of *holy persons, or saints.*"—p. 103. *Sancta* belongs to the Church in the broader sense; *Sanctorum* is used of the higher saintship. See Robinson, sub. ἀγιοί, Pearson *Tab. Cat.*, p. 101, also the dogmatists in their explanations of *Communio Sanctorum*. *Sanctorum* is uniformly made

In an appendix to the Book of Concord published at Leipzig, 1677, we have an exposition of the Creed. *Communio Sanctorum* is treated apart from *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, as follows: SANCTORUM, sanctitate tum imputata, qua meritum Christi nobis imputatur, tum inchoata qua subinde crescunt motus spirituales, notitia, timor, spes, et dilectio. COMMUNIONEM, non tantum *externam* in Verbi, Sacramentorum, rituum, professionis, et conversionis societate positam, sed vel maxime *internam* fidei et dilectionis, de quo copulandis pluribus Ecclesiae membris inter se, vinculo, Paulus loquitur." In Spener's *Tabulae Catecheticae*, under *Tabula XXXV*, we have ECCLESIAE NOTAE, DURATIO ET COMMUNIO SANCTORUM. He says: "*Communio Sanctorum*. The saints are all true members of the Church, sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Among these there is communion, not only of temporal, but of spiritual blessings. They have the same head, benefits, means; Eph. 4 : 3, 4, 5, 6; John 17 : 17, 20; 1 John 1 : 3. Hence whatever is given to any of the brethren is given also for my good; whatever is promised to any one, is promised also to me. The prayers of all are poured out also for me. These are grounds of comfort. In turn this communion binds us to believe that all things good or evil are common, to share with others, to assist, to love others, to pray for others. 1. Cor. 12 : 18; Rom. 12 : 4, 5, 6; Eph. 4 : 15, 16; 6 : 18. *Wir stehen alle in gemeinen Gütern*."

Chemnitz, *Examen*, Ed. Preuss, p. 811, says: "All believers in common have communion or participation of those blessings which are contained in the following articles of the Remission of Sins, and Eternal Life, * * There is a communion of all the saints, all of whom in common, in like manner, and equally, by the grace of God, on account of the merit of Christ, by faith, receive remission of sins and eternal life." Gerhard, *De Eccle.*, Cap. III: "When the Church is called the Communion of Saints, it must be understood not only of the true and living members of the Church militant in this life, but also of the Church triumphant in heaven, for together they constitute one Church."

the equivalent of *vere credentium* or *vere fidelium*. Boerner says: "By that name are designated those who truly believe in Christ." *Institutiones Theol. Symb.*, p. 671.

Accordingly Gerhard denominates *Sanctos* not only those who with true faith still contend in this life against the devil, but also and more especially those who have gloriously triumphed in heaven. *Ut Supra*. We therefore accept it as scripturally, confessionally, historically and didactically correct, to call the Church a CONGREGATION OF SAINTS, when reference is had *strictly* and *solely* to the *invisible* body of the Lord Jesus Christ, composed of all those of every name and in every place, who with true faith strive against sin, together with all those who, triumphing over sin and death, have entered the heavenly rest. These are one assemblage,—“no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens of the saints”—between whom there is a true communion, both external and internal as it pertains to those on earth, and truly spiritual as between the saints below and the saints above. And it is to express this thought and to emphasize this momentum of the Church’s faith, viz., a common participation* by all the members of the *coetus invisibilis* in the blessings of redemption,—Forgiveness of sins; Resurrection of the body; Life everlasting,—that *Communio Sanctorum* must be reserved, as expressing an essential idea contained in *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, but by no means as identical with it, or equivalent to it. And by “essential idea” in this connection, is meant that in this Holy Catholic Church there are true saints (*sancti*) who have a common inheritance—“*Wir stehen alle in gemeinen Gütern.*” Or that he who would find the Communion of Saints, must seek it in the Holy Catholic Church, as likewise Forgiveness of sins; Resurrection of the body; Life everlasting.

*The dogmatical and catechetical writers always explain *communio* as an abstract noun, generally equal to *participatio*: “All the saints have communion or participation.” Chemnitz, *Examen*, Ed. Preuss, p. 811. “Communion of saints is external and internal. The external consists in the possession of the same faith and the use of the same sacraments. The internal communion is spiritual, consisting in participation, &c.”—Gerhard. *De Eccle.*, Cap. III., 16.

“*With whom do saints hold communion or fellowship?*” 1. With the Father, 2. With the Son, 3. With the Holy Ghost, 4. With holy angels, 5. With other saints on earth and in glory.”—Church Catechism *ut supra*, p. 105. See Catechisms of Lyser and Spener, also Westcott’s *Historic Faith*, p. 241, *et seq.*

ing,*—all of which as corollaries grow out of faith in the Holy Catholic Church, as this itself grows out of *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum*, for he who believes in the Holy Spirit, will believe that He is energetic, and that through the word and the sacraments, He will beget a society in which will be found all the blessings of redemption.

This view of *Communio Sanctorum* has its ground in the Holy Scriptures (see *supra*, *ad initium*) and has the most indubitable historical support in the Church; and it was especially emphasized by and during the Reformation in opposition to the pure externalism of Rome.

Luther in somewhat happy inconsistency with his own definitions, set the example in his final explanation of *Communio Sanctorum* in the Large Catechism, and is followed by the dogmatical and catechetical writers of the Lutheran Church, though in general with more stress laid on the main idea of common participation.

But Luther errs historically (see *supra*, *ad initium*) when he says: *Ist nichts anders, denn die Glosse oder Auslegung, da jemand hat willen deuten, was die Christliche Kirche heisse.*—*Rather does it explain what the Christian Church contains.* He also errs philologically when he says that *Communio* ought to be translated *Gemeine*, that is, *congregation*, thus making it equivalent to *ecclesia*, which, he says, properly means nothing else than *congregation*.

In classic Latin the word *communio* is always used as an abstract noun in our sense of *communion*, *common participation*. Thus the standard Latin dictionaries. It is never used as the equivalent of *congregatio* or *coetus*, or of any word that means assemblage. Cicero uses it in this way: *Communio legis, C. Juris, sanguinis, literarum et vocum*—where the fundamental and only idea is that of common participation, *communion* from *communis*. The word, though not found in the Vulgate as the rendering of *κοινωνία*, early entered into the vocabulary of the Church with the meaning as found always in classic Latin.†

*See Chemnitz, *Exam.*, Ed. Preuss, p. 811.

†We mean here the very earliest Christian ages. For later variations see Du Cange *et al. infra*.

Subsequently it also came to mean the *Eucharist*, evidently from St. Paul, 1 Cor. 10 : 16. It thus acquired a technical use and a definite meaning which it has retained to this day. The word passed into the English language as *communion* in the general sense of participation, and with the ecclesiastical meanings found in Walker's Dictionary and Webster's under 3 and 4, and in the Imperial, under 4 and 5. In the sense of "A body of Christians having one common faith and discipline," it is of frequent occurrence among theological writers,* as Lutheran communion, equal to Lutheran Church; Episcopal communion, equal to Episcopal Church; which, so far from being equivalent to *Ecclesia Catholica* in the historical and confessional sense, by the use of such words as "our," "other," "Greek," "Romish," "Protestant," and many others similarly used, actually divides *Ecclesia Catholica* almost without limit. English usage, with which is *arbitrium et jus et norma loquendi*, does not sanction *communion* in the sense of *congregation*, much less in the sense of *Ecclesia Catholica*; nor is it ever so used by English writers, except by those who are determined to make *Communio Sanctorum* the equivalent of *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, which they can render intelligible to English readers only by an explanation. When the word *communio* found its way into the Creed in the eighth century, it was not possible for it to be used in the sense of "A body of Christians having one common faith and discipline," as that definition is now used in English, because then all Christendom was one, and knew itself as *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, which form of expression the Roman Catholic Church never has held and does not now hold, as equivalent to *Communio Sanctorum*—using the word *communio* always in the sense either of *participation*† or *Eucharistia*. Consequently had it been desired at that time, the eighth century, to add a clause

*"Our divines generally as well as in other communions," Jacobs, B. C., Vol. II., p. 14. "Not only of our own communion, but I will venture to say of all Christian communions," Westcott, *Hist. Faith*, p. 120. "The three great communions into which the Christian Church is divided, are those of the Greek, the Romish and the Protestant Churches," Webster.

†The exceptions are technical, but always have the fundamental idea of *participatio*. See Du Cange, *infra*.

to the Creed as purely appositional with, or as purely predicative of the *Holy Catholic Church*, *Communio Sanctorum* could not have been that clause, because the word *communio** did not have the meaning of *Sancta Ecclesia* or of *coetus*, or of *congregatio*, and consequently it could not and would not have been understood in the sense of *congregation*, for, as in the Scriptures, so in the Creed, words were used in the sense sanctioned by the time,—a principle which is as fundamental in the interpretation of the Creed as it is in the interpretation of the Scripture; otherwise we will never know what either means. And as we interpret every other clause of the Creed by the grammatico-historical exegesis, so this also, until it shall have been shown that *communio* had at that time, the eighth century, or whenever it was admitted to the Creed, in current usage, the

*So far as I can find, Augustine uses the word only in the sense of common participation: *Multi sunt in sacramentorum communione cum ecclesia et tamen jam non sunt in ecclesia. De Unit. Eccle.* The only use that Quenstedt makes of *Communio Sanctorum* in his *Symtema* is: *Symbolum Apostolicum describit unitatem ecclesiae per κοινωνίαν ἁγίων, sive Communione, Sanctorum qua scil. fideles in Christo cum ipso et inter se communicent. De Ec. Sec. 1., xxii.*

Du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, Paris, 1840, says: "These words (communio, communicare) are used in different senses by the Fathers and in the councils: Nam *Communicare* dicuntur qui cum aliquo communionem invicem habuit ut Christiani ac fideles. Deinde *Communicare* dicitur qui sacram eucharistiam percepit.

COMMUNIO, Antiphona, a song sung by the choir during the communion.

COMMUNIO which celebrates the slaughter of the Thuringians by the Saxons in 834.

COMMUNIO, Oblatio, largitio.

COMMUNIO, Societas, participatio.

COMMUNIO, Conspiratio. These meanings of *Communio* are amply illustrated in Du Cange, and show that "by the Fathers and in the councils," the word never has the sense of *coetus* or *congregatio* or *ecclesia*.

Forcellini and Facioli, *Tatius Latinitatis Lexicon*, says: *Apud Ecclesiae Scriptores:*

Communio est consuetudo et conversatio mutua Christianorum inter se.

Item participatio Sacra Eucharistia.

Speciatim *communio* laica.

Communione mortis scito.

Neither of these greatest standard Latin dictionaries in any way indicates that *communio* was ever used in defining *ecclesia* in whole or in part,

sense of *congregation* or *coetus*. In the Greek text of the Creed we have *κοινωνία ἁγίων*. This is a literal translation of *Communio Sanctorum*. In classic Greek the word *κοινωνία** means *fellowship, participation, the having things in common*, from *κοινός*, *common, shared alike by all*. This meaning of common participation, as an abstract noun, it has always in the New Testament, except, according to Robinson, at Rom. 15 : 26 ; 2 Cor. 9 : 13, Heb. 13 : 16, where it means "*a contribution, a collection of money in behalf of poorer churches*," the underlying idea still being that of common participation, in that the rich should share their possessions with the poor. Moreover, this word *κοινωνία* is the word used before all others to express the common fellowship which the saints have with each other ; and so very generally is the word used in this sense, and so almost exclusively is it appropriated to the inculcation of this doctrine, as to lead to the belief that if the passages in which this word appears, had not been found in the New Testament, the *Communio Sanctorum* had not been found in the Creed, and had never become an article of faith in the Church, inasmuch as so little that is clear and decisive, is elsewhere taught about the communion of saints. Now when the faith of the Church, expressed in *Communio Sanctorum*, was to be placed in the Greek text of the Creed, lo ! here were the very words of inspiration ready to receive it—words embalmed in the heart of the Church, and already and for centuries consecrated to the very doctrine in question, *κοινωνία ἁγίων*, the former in its etymological signification and in its historical use corresponding exactly to *Communio*, while *ἅγιοι* was the common designation for saints, Christians ; that is, the translation put the Church's formulated faith right back into the original words of Holy Writ, which

* *Κοινωνία*, *communio, communitas, consortium, societas*. Cicero translates it *communem societatem*. Stephen's *Thesaurus Graecus*. *Κοινωνία*. *Communio*. *Beneficentia*. Syn. *Κοινωνημα, ανακοινωνσις, κοινοτης, μεταδοσις, μετουσια, μετοχη, μεδεξις, συγκληρωσις*. Morell's *Lexicon*.

It will thus appear that the highest philological authorities, both Latin and Greek, are decisive against the view of Luther.

had not changed their meaning by their ecclesiastical employment; that is, ἅγιοι still meant *saints*, and κοινωνία still meant *communion*, and not σύνοδος, συναγωγή, πανήγυρις, which Suidas and Hysechius give as the synonyms of ἐκκλησία.

These facts, then, the fundamental and etymological meaning of the words *communio* and κοινωνία, and their well-known historical usage, put it beyond question that neither of them could have been regarded as fairly synonymous with *ecclesia* or *coetus*, with σύνοδος or συναγωγή or πανήγυρις, and consequently that *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica* and *Communio Sanctorum* do not express one and the same idea, and that the latter is epexegetical of the former only in so far as it expresses the one fundamental idea that the Communion of Saints is found only in the Holy Catholic Church, which same affirmation can also be made of the remaining clauses in the Third Article.

This being the conclusion, then, that Communion of Saints is not merely a gloss or explanation of Holy Catholic Church, there can be no question as to the punctuation: If the other clauses of the Third Article be separated by commas, semicolons, colons, periods, so these two. In Müller's *Symbolische Bücher*, p. 29, all the clauses of this Article, both German and Latin, are separated by periods. At p. 358, all are alike separated by commas. In the B. C. published at Leipzig, 1677, p. 1, all the clauses of this article are separated by colons. In Hase's *Libri Symbolici*, p. 1, they are all separated by commas. In B. C., Leipzig, 1790, only commas are used. In *Agende* of Pennsylvania Synod, 1786, only commas. In Henkel's *Catechism*, 1811, periods only. In Melancthon's *Corpus Doctrinae*, edited by himself in 1560, the very year of his death, we have colons only, in the third article. To the above list reaching back to the period of the Reformation may be added the following catechisms which punctuate all the clauses of the article co-ordinately: Weyl, Balto., 1860; Caspari, Milwaukee; Mann and Krotel, 1864; Missouri Synod's *Agende*; Wetzel (Woodstock) 1872; also Schaff, (*Creeds of Chris.*), Latin, Greek and English. Of the many editions of the *Catechism* and *Symbolical Books* which we have examined, only the following make a distinction in the punctuation of the clauses of the third article: Dieter-

ich's Catechism, Berlin, 1864, separates the clauses in question by a comma but places a period between the others; the same, (English) Columbus, 1872, uses a comma between Holy Catholic Church and Communion of Saints, but semicolons with the other clauses, as does also the Book of Concord (Jacobs) 1882.

We have not had the means of carrying our examinations further; but from the above exhibit it can easily be seen that the authority for co-ordinate punctuation is well-nigh overwhelming. And yet it must be conceded that co-ordinate punctuation is not decisive of the views of an editor as to the relation of Holy Catholic Church to Communion of Saints, since it may be shown that some expounders of the Creed who punctuate co-ordinately, regard *Communio Sanctorum* as appositive or epexegetical of *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*. Yet such authorities as Melancthon, Rechenberg, Spener, Müller, Hase, the fathers of the Pennsylvania Synod, the Missouri theologians *et al.*, ought to be guides for us; and if the argument in the preceding pages shows that *Communio Sanctorum* is not commensurate with *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, and that the former was not introduced as "a gloss or explanation by which some one meant to explain what the Christian Church is," then it is evident that co-ordinate punctuation *ought* to prevail throughout the entire third article of the Creed, for all the clauses after the first bear the same relation to *credo*;* that is, they each express a distinct momentum of the Church's faith. And in thus co-ordinating *Communio Sanctorum* with the other clauses of the third article of the Creed, and in making it a separate article of faith, we do not destroy the analogy of the faith, as Gerhard† declares that even they do not destroy the analogy of the faith who separate this article from the preceding and interpret it of the participation in the sacraments; neither do we vacate our right to be called a Lutheran, since it is as clear as day that Chemnitz and Gerhard and others who join it with the preceding article, do *in fact* make it a distinct article of faith, for in the first place they all make it less extensive than Holy Catholic Church, and

*We say *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum*; but *Credo Sanctam Eccl. Cath.*, etc.

†*De Eccl., cap. III., 16.*

secondly, they all make the chief idea that of common participation in the blessings of redemption. Moreover, when we make it a distinct article of faith we in so far return to the original design of the clause; although we do not thereby obligate ourselves to return absolutely to the original meaning of the clause, since, as Wilson has said, new opinions have gathered round and appropriated this term; or rather, the term originally having the idea of communion in a very narrow sense, has broadened that idea and embraced in it, especially since the Reformation, a fulness of meaning which corresponds more nearly to the teaching of the Scriptures, that all believers are common participants externally of the word and the sacraments, and internally of faith, love, and the Holy Ghost. Or as Bishop Nicholson has put it: "The meaning of this part of the Creed, is, that the saints have in common one God, one Christ, one Spirit, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one Hope: and they communicate in all duties of charity and piety," *Expos. of Cat.*, p. 63, which agrees in every essential particular with the explanations given above from Chemnitz, Gerhard, Spener and others.

COROLLARIES.

1. If we believe the communion of saints, we believe also that all true believers, all saints in the higher sense, all who have living faith and the Holy Ghost, are, equally with ourselves, fellow-citizens with the saints, partakers of the divine nature, our brethren, entitled to be called and treated as our brethren; and hence we must heartily say with Bishop McIlvaine, "I cannot allow the partition walls, which divide the courts of the Lord's visible house, to prevent me from the precious enjoyment resulting from the thought that wherever my Lord has a true believer, I have a brother."*

2. It is historically justifiable by the example of our forefathers, to expand an article of faith, and to attach to it opinions which it did not originally bear, for it is certain that since the days of the Reformation Protestant theologians have expanded

*See "Luther and the Swiss" (*ad Finem*) by Uhlhorn. Translated by Krotel.

communio Sanctorum, and have attached notions to it which it was not originally intended to express, and in doing so they are not supposed to have denied the faith, nor to have cut themselves off from the COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

PHILLIPS & HUNT, NEW YORK.

For Sale by the J. B. Lippincott Co., Phila.

The Logic of Introspection; or Method in Mental Science. By Rev. J. B. Wentworth, D. D. pp. 446.

The theme of this book is *Psychologic Method*, and it is intended as a criticism of the application of the Baconian inductive method in the study of psychology. In the introductory chapter the author sets forth the importance of a correct method, and seeks to determine the only true way of discovering it. The body of the work is divided into four Books, the first reviewing the Status of Psychological Method; the second, the Inductive Method, with its proper Domain and Limitation; the third, the True Psychologic Method; and fourth, Inferences and Conclusions. There are many things in the work which will interest students of mental science, and many sharp and just criticisms of the statements of various psychologists. Dr. Wentworth, however, it seems to us, is wrong in conceiving of the Inductive Method, professedly accepted by various psychologists, in the specific and restricted sense in which that philosopher formulated it in connection with physical investigation. The scope of the method has been enlarged in common employment and used to express the general plan of reaching true conclusions on the basis of exact observation of all the phenomena of either mind or matter—whether the observations be made by the sense-perceptions or by the intuitive consciousness. In neither case—in the study of nature nor of mind—does the process stop with simple observation, but the Reason, with its intuitional perceptions and necessary judgments, discerns the deeper realities in the facts. Certainly, the Baconian method, in the restricted form in which it was originally defined for physical investigation, would alone be a very inadequate instrument for constructing a full psychology, but it seems to us that Dr. Wentworth is arbitrary, and entirely too sweeping, in denying the legitimacy, in mental study, of the method in its enlarged and more general sense.

While it is doubtful whether those who have avowedly used the Inductive Method in psychology, are deserving of the thorough condem-

nation which Dr. Wentworth accords to them, he has called attention to many passages in which its use has not been happy. He writes with ability. The work throughout shows wide reading, independent thinking, and a careful elaboration of the materials used. Its chief value consists in the stress the author lays upon the reality and reliability of the intuitional action of the Reason in the investigation of psychological truth.

M. V.

Commentary on the Old Testament. Vol. VII.—Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah. Book of Isaiah, by H. Bannister, D. D. Books of Jeremiah and of the Lamentations, by F. D. Hemenway, D. D. D. D. Whedon, LL. D., Editor. pp. 472. 1886.

If they only knew it, the majority of preachers and Bible students can derive a great deal more profit from the use of such a commentary than from the extremely learned and critical works which owe their wide circulation to the distinction of the author's name and the business enterprise of publishers. For all practical purposes Whedon's Commentary is sufficiently learned, while the reader, on the other hand, will not be diverted by it from the study of God's word to the laborious study of a commentary. The theories and objections of skeptical criticism are not ignored, but the authors do not consider the discussion of these to be the main duty of an expositor. The Later Prophecies of Isaiah are ascribed by Dr. Bannister to Isaiah himself with the admission that much honest criticism assumes another hypothesis solely on critical grounds. We note with a keen sense of the Church's loss the death both of Dr. Whedon the editor and of both the authors of this volume prior to its issue from the press. But the work will go on and two more volumes—the Pentateuch, and Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Minor Prophets are well advanced.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

Geological Studies; or Elements of Geology. For High Schools, Colleges, Normal and other Schools. Part I. Geology Inductively Presented. Part II. Geology Treated Systematically. With 367 illustrations in the Text. By Alexander Winchell, LL. D., Professor of Geology and Palæontology in the University of Michigan, Formerly Director of the Geological Survey of Michigan, Author of "Geological Excursions," for Elementary Schools, also of "Sketches of Creation," "World-Life," etc., etc. pp. 513. 1886.

Prof. Winchell's rare ability as a geologist and large experience as a practical educator, have given him unsurpassed qualifications for the production of a text-book on this interesting science. An examination of the work before us justifies the favorable expectation raised by the author's eminence in this department of study.

This text-book is constructed upon a unique method, adapting the

progress of investigation to what is usually known as the 'natural order,' beginning with observation and study of the plainest and simplest facts, and then proceeding to a classified and systematic view of the phenomena. The order assumes that the Professor and his class shall commence in the most natural way, going forth, with hammers and other necessary instruments, into the fields or woods, and examining the facts concerned as they are presented to the eye. This will prepare the student to understand and appreciate the subject-matter of the subsequent descriptions and scientific explanations. Hence Part I. of the work treats of Geology as presented "inductively," and furnishes the learner with a mass of materials, as facts and doctrines, the substantial foundations of a geological education. Part II., treating geology systematically, reduces the collected body of facts and principles to methodical re-presentation and scientific order and coherence. Here the discussions of the several topics, touched on in the first part, are completed, and the various portions are adjusted to a logical relation.

This is undoubtedly the true method in pursuing geological studies, and it seems to us that Prof. Winchell has most admirably constructed his text-book for carrying the method into effect. The materials are mostly from American geology, the discussion is fresh and original, and the facts and principles, throughout, are illustrated by apt and fine illustrations. Tables, maps, and other aids to both teacher and student are supplied to an unusual extent.

In a text-book, especially in such a science as geology, much of the comfort of students as well as teachers depends on the publisher. In this case, the publishers, according to their well-known enterprise and taste, have given the whole work, in paper, printing, illustrations, and general mechanical execution, a perfection difficult to surpass. Altogether, the method and attractiveness of the volume, compared with the text-books which some of us had to use in our student days, almost begets the wish that we had the course to go over again.

Prof. Winchell is known as a thorough adherent and advocate of the theory of evolution. Of course this theory is assumed and set forth in this work. It comes up naturally in tracing the progress of terrestrial life. We would prefer a less positive assertion of this hypothesis. The facts in the case, even as detailed by the author, do not seem to us to establish it, and it would be better if Dr. Winchell had maintained more reserve in this connection. We greatly prefer the position of Prof. Dawson on this point. But the general merits of the work are of such high order that its teaching on this point may be passed by with the simple expression of dissent.

M. V.

H. B. GARNER, PHILADELPHIA.

For Sale by Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia.

Biblical Theology of the Old Testament. Based on Oehler. By Revere Franklin Weidner, Prof. of Theology. Rock Island, Ill. pp. 224. 1886.

This is Part II. of Prof. Weidner's work on *Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology* and is sure, like Part I., *Exegetical Theology*, to command a very favorable reception. The volume opens with a very brief *resumé* of Sacred History followed by a discriminating list of standard works in this department. All the remainder of the volume is devoted to the Theology of the Old Testament, on the basis of Oehler's great and masterly work. Scholars have learned to appreciate the distinguished German who in this particular sphere had no superior in his day, but the complete volume is not well adapted as a text-book. Professor Weidner is a practical man and it is evidently his primary aim to meet the needs of American students. A German author is very much like a vine, the more he is pruned, the more fruitful will he be found to Americans, whose preparatory training does not as a rule qualify them to master a production of German Science. The abridgement is, therefore, sure to replace the unabridged work in the class-room. Sometimes, of course, the editor has omitted too much of what seems to us important, as for instance in the use and meaning of the shed blood and in the second principal view of the Malakh Jehovah, but it would be difficult for two minds to agree on the amount of condensation admissible. It must not be supposed either that the present work is merely an abridgment. Prof. W. has also contributed some additions. That "Oehler represents the most conservative tendency of the Lutheran Theology of Germany" is a statement that requires modification. His relation to the first edition of *Herzog* is alone an indication of the altitude of his Lutheranism.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

Scriptures Hebrew and Christian, Arranged and Edited for Young Readers as an Introduction to the Study of the Bible. By Edward T. Bartlett, A. M., Dean of the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School in Philadelphia and John P. Peters, Ph. D., Professor of the Old Testament Languages and Literature in the same Institution. Vol. I. *Hebrew Story* from Creation to the Exile. Comprising material from the following Books of the Old Testament: Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, I. and II. Samuel, I. and II. Kings, I. and II. Chronicles, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah. pp. 545. 1886.

The somewhat extended title indicates pretty clearly the character and aim of this work. It is a kind of condensation and in part rearrangement of the Bible, preserving for the most part the language of

either the Authorized Version or the recent Canterbury Revision, though sometimes deviating from both in the interest of simplification, and adding occasional glosses. Practical rather than critical considerations have determined the selection and arrangements of passages, yet the best results of critical scholarship have evidently been utilized both in the determination of the original text and its interpretation.

At the head of each chapter have been placed, for purposes of reference, the Bible Chapters from which that chapter has been composed, and then neither the reader nor the sense is confused by the common breaking up of a chapter into small verses. A portion of the Psalms, of Proverbs and of the principal Prophecies are incorporated with the historical parts to which they are supposed to belong chronologically and by which they are often illustrated and interpreted. The rendering of the poetical parts receives careful attention with a view to approximate their original form as well as to bring out more fully their sentiment.

Vol. II. will deal with Jewish history from the Captivity to the time of Christ, Hebrew Laws and Customs, and Hebrew Literature. Vol. III. will contain selections from the New Testament. The general plan of the work must be commended as most excellent by all who are familiar with the study of the Scriptures. It will be a valuable guide to many of the older as well as the younger readers of the Bible for whom it was specially edited, and will give them a fuller knowledge of biblical history than can ordinarily be obtained from reading the entire Scriptures as we have them. The volume gives evidence of much care and labor, of good judgment and mature scholarship. The editors have done their work well and the publishers have gotten it out in capital form.

The Story of Germany. By Sabine Baring-Gould, M. A., author of "Germany, Present and Past," etc., with the collaboration of Arthur Gilman, M. A., author of "The Story of Rome," "A History of the American People," etc. pp. 437. 1886.

This is another volume of the series, entitled "The Story of the Nations," now being published by this house. It is admirably adapted for young readers in the style and language used, it being remarkably racy and simple. In a bare outline, such as this must necessarily be in covering over two thousand years, the most salient points are the only ones that can be given, and these are presented quite well. We were entertained, however, on page 187, by the attempt to show the difference in views between the Romish Church and Luther. We quote it:

"Hitherto, the Catholic Church had taught that no man could be certain of pardon for his sins, of being justified before God, and of eternal salvation. Everything was conditional. A man was pardoned

his sins *if* he was truly sorry, *if* he confessed them, and *if* he did his utmost to make amends for the wrong done. Justification was the becoming perfectly good and pleasing to God, and man was to aim at this all through life, with hard struggle, helped by divine grace, and the sacraments were the means whereby divine help was given him to push on to perfection. So this, also, was conditional. Lastly, salvation was certain to none without final perseverance. Now, Martin Luther was a very eager, anxious-minded man, and he could not be happy unless he were quite certain of pardon, justification, and salvation. He suffered great distress of mind, through fear of falling short and losing heaven, knowing himself to be a man of violent passions. All at once a new idea struck him, which made all easy and secure. If a man *felt* that he was pardoned, justified, and saved, then the certainty was his. To this feeling of assurance that all was right he gave the name of faith, and called the change from a state of uncertainty to one of confidence,—justification by faith. No more conditions were required, no more chance of fall remained. This doctrine made immense way; it was seized with eagerness."

The illustrations show very well the progress in the art of engraving as well as what was intended by them. The last are the pictures of Bismarck, Emperor William, and the prince imperial, Frederick William. The book is attractive in type and general finish.

PORTER & COATES, PHILADELPHIA.

The Battle of Gettysburg: From "The History of the Civil War in America." By the Comte de Paris. Published by special arrangement with the author. pp. 315.

The battle of Gettysburg is regarded not only the greatest ever fought on American soil but one of the greatest in the world's whole history. It has already been the subject of many volumes, and promises to be that of many more. Those that have appeared, while they seem to agree in the main features, differ widely in details, and have given rise to many controversies in pamphlets and the periodical prints. The one that goes most into detail, and which is, at the same time, the most unbiased is that of the Comte de Paris, found in the third volume of his "History of the Civil War in America," and now issued as a separate volume under the editorship of Col. J. P. Nicholson, of Philadelphia. As a foreigner, the author could follow the different armies and observe their movements with a cooler head and more impartiality than an American, whose heart would be with one side or the other. He observed and studied with all the fidelity of a true historian, and, with access to official and reliable un-official documents, he has given an account of this great battle which is *facile princeps*, for accuracy and fullness, among all that have appeared.

IVISON, BLAKEMAN, TAYLOR & CO., NEW YORK AND CHICAGO.

Outlines of Universal History. Designed as a Text-Book and for private reading. By George Park Fisher, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Yale College. pp. 674.

Dr. Fisher's attainments in history and his merits as an author are such that a new book of this character from his pen may in advance be accepted as comprehensive, philosophical, impartial, masterful and readable. The closest examination of this volume will confirm this *a priori* estimate. It was a great undertaking to reduce to the compass of a single convenient volume the enormous material collected from the earliest dawn of authentic history to the last quarter of the nineteenth century, but Dr. Fisher was equal to the task and he has given us in this compact form the essential facts of history in all countries and all ages of the world—a vast array of information presented in methodical arrangement, in just proportions and in a lucid and graphic style. The private reader can not complain of dry-as-dust pages. The teacher of history will find it unequalled as a text-book and the general student will keep it on his revolving book-case as an indispensable book of reference. Among the features that will be most prized are the numerous maps which illustrate the successive stages of Empire. The bibliography supplied at the end of each section furnishes the best accessible guides for the farther study of any particular period or subject. No work has appeared for a long time from the American press that has received such unqualified and universal praise as these "Outlines of Universal History."

FUNK & WAGNALLS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

The Simplicity that is in Christ. Sermons to the Woodland Church, Philadelphia. By Leonard Woolsey Bacon. pp. 339. 1886.

For entertaining, instructive, searching and stimulating presentations of the gospel we do not know a cleverer example than the polished author of these sermons. And if he would confine himself to 'the simplicity that is in Christ' the American pulpit would have scarcely a brighter light. But Dr. Bacon has a constitutional fondness for that which is just the reverse of simplicity. He loves to entangle men in doctrinal confusion. Even these sermons reveal a disposition not to clear up hazy truths but to magnify what is defective in their statement and to distort accepted definitions. Whatever lofty aim may actuate these vigorous and sprightly discussions, they are so over-seasoned with cavil and caricature as to cause more provocation than profit. Take as an instance the sermon on the "Simplicity of Faith," which the author admits to be somewhat of a theological treatise. He sets up a number of "mistaken definitions of faith" which in his extensive studies he has found among Calvinistic authors, and claims that it is a question to this day among theologians what that thing is to which the promise of eter-

nal salvation is given? He affects keen regret that there is no controversy rife on this subject, and charges that the most generally current definition of faith is the assent of the intellect to truth.

The critic cannot believe that Dr. Bacon is groping here in ignorance. He is too brilliant a scholar not to know the distinctions of *Crede Deum*, *Crede Deo*, and *Crede in Deum*, which are as old as Augustine, which even scholastic theology took pains to maintain, and a Scriptural basis for which is given unmistakably in Jno. 14 : 10-12. Dr. Bacon well knows that all Protestant Churches and theologians hold that there are diversities of faith, and if representative Presbyterian divines do actually teach that faith "is nothing more than the intellectual act of believing"—"a simple credence of the truths of revelation," and that this saves the sinner, then it can be easily shown that notwithstanding their great renown and representative position these teachers subverted the doctrines of the Church Catholic. It might be well for this assailant of Calvinism to study on this point the great Lutheran dogmaticians who in the seventeenth century gave careful and precise definitions to Reformation theology. That Dr. B. did not wholly despair of stirring up a quarrel by the publication of these sermons may be gathered from an extract of the preface: "Something seemed to be due to those persons who have manifested an eager desire to find something to complain of in my preaching, but have had little or no opportunity of having it. I am afraid that they will be disappointed in the book; but they may be assured that they were considered in the selection of sermons for it, with an honest purpose of giving them such as they would most enjoy being displeased with."

English Hymns: Their Authors and History. By Samuel Willoughby Duffield, Author of "The Latin Hymn Writers and their Hymns," "The Heavenly Land," etc., etc. pp. 675. 1886.

Thousands use the Psalms and other parts of sacred Scripture in their devotions without any knowledge of the occasion or circumstances to which they owe their origin, yet what an addition of interest and often of edification the history of these inspired lyrics is apt to awaken. In like manner the peculiar incidents, personal experiences, and notable or historical associations connected with many of our popular hymns render them even more precious and more powerful. Eliminate the storms of the Reformation and the heroic struggles of Luther from the Battle-Hymn "Ein feste Burg" and you destroy a large measure of its force and meaning. Perhaps its greatest merit lies in the truth that it is "the Reformation in Song." How it helps to stir one's soul when in singing "Fear not, O little flock, the foe" we remember that it was the battle-song of Gustavus Adolphus' army, primarily his own composition, and that after the king had knelt in their presence and invoked the aid of heaven, the army was accustomed to burst out in these inspiring

strains of praise and trust. A chapter from real life is thus associated with many of the songs of Zion and some of them offer enough of such material to fill a volume. Much of this belongs of course to the department of legend, but Dr. Duffield has obviously taken pains to sift out the truth and he parts with the most beautiful traditions when they prove to have no basis of fact. What a delightful exercise it is likewise to trace a noble hymn through several translations to its supposed original far down the ages. Believers who now sing "O Sacred head, now wounded," cannot be separated by a wide chasm from the Lutherans who more than two centuries ago contemplated their dying Saviour in the strains of Gerhardt's "O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden" and these in their turn must have been one in faith with the saints of the twelfth century for whom Bernard of Clairvaux composed "*Salve Caput Cruentatum*." Good judgment, sound taste, and a reverent care for spiritual interests mark the volume and it is to be welcomed as a handbook of solid and enduring value by all who love "the good old hymns." How the joys of our life are multiplied by the writers who keep in mind the law of the association of ideas and who base their literary labors on that universal law.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

The Six Days of Creation. The Fall and The Deluge. By. J. B. Reimensnyder, D. D., author of "Heavenward," "Doom Eternal," "Spiritualism," etc. pp. 368.

Dr. Reimensnyder has given us a very readable volume on a theme of transcendent interest, and the publisher has made it very attractive to the eye. The chaste style of the author marks every page and passages of genuine eloquence abound. But best of all the work is conceived and executed with a view to edification, and while dealing with questions that have puzzled the profoundest philosophers, it treats them in such a way that spiritual and practical reflections press upon the reader continually and the untutored layman as well as the scholar may study every chapter with pleasure and profit.

On the skeptical questions raised in connection with the historic events discussed, Dr. Reimensnyder is eminently conservative. His readers will be in no danger of having their simple minds corrupted by the novelties of science falsely so-called. The old theories about the six natural days, the origin of man, the extent of the flood, not to mention the position of woman, are here maintained without wavering or qualification. And this not because of the author's ignorance of modern scientific teachings, but because he regards the old theories as better than the new. He might indeed have dwelt more on the fact that some of the ablest biblical scholars accept the conclusions of scientists on these points as fully harmonizing with Moses. It is, however, a happy relief not to be kept toiling all the time in the meshes of theories and

hypotheses which blind the eye to the underlying spiritual truths that form the essential contents of Sacred Writ. The chapter on "The Sabbath of Creation—Institution and Obligation" is especially deserving of attention and admiration.

The Stork Family in the Lutheran Church: or Biographical sketches of Rev. Charles Augustus Gottlieb Stork, Rev. Theophilus Stork, D. D., and Rev. Charles A. Stork, D. D. By John G. Morris, D. D., LL. D., author of "Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry," "Journeys of Luther," "Luther at Coburg," etc., etc. pp. 263. 1886.

This is the first of a series of biographical sketches of deceased Lutheran ministers which, we are gratified to learn, the Lutheran Board of Publication has decided to issue. It is a worthy forerunner in subjects and interest, and we trust that those which are to follow will fully equal it. It is the story of grandfather, father and son—three men whose lives cover the period of the growth of the Lutheran Church from its small beginnings to what it now is, the third in numerical strength of the Protestant denominations in the United States.

The sketch of the grandfather is short, owing to the scarcity of data readily accessible. It is, however, intensely interesting, and the reader will regret there is not more of it. For the other two the author had ample material, but was under orders to keep within a limited space, and hence had to omit much of what he had gathered. The letters give evidence of glowing earnestness and piety. Nowhere can we find men more sincere and more consecrated to their calling as ministers of the Gospel than the three Storks. They were Israelites in whom there was no guile, and preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ was their delight. We here recall part of a conversation with the youngest, five or six months after entering upon his duties in the Theological Seminary. He rather abruptly asked: "B—, do you like teaching young men?" To my affirmative reply he said: "There isn't half the satisfaction to me that there was in preaching regularly." And yet what a teacher he was! Ask the young men who were under him. But as a preacher he specially excelled.

All three had their periods of despondency—perhaps a case of hereditary transmission, or possibly due to lack of vigorous health. There is a vein of sadness running through each of the three lives, due possibly to frequency of depression, and yet a strength of faith that is positively exhilarating to a Christian. As preachers and humble believers they were men whose biographies will not fail to prove helpful to others.

Our notice would not be complete without referring to the letters of Mrs. Emma B. Stork, wife of Dr. Theophilus, which occupy so large a space and show not only a pure, Christian spirit, but also a high degree of literary culture.

Biography of Alfred J. Fox, M. D., Evangelical Lutheran Minister of the Tennessee Synod, and Physician. By his son, Rev. Junius B. Fox, A. M., with an introduction by his son, Prof. Luther A. Fox, D. D. pp. 150. 1885.

A modest volume, but one that serves as a genuine enrichment of our biographical literature. Dr. Fox was a conspicuous and honored figure in the peculiar history of the Lutheran Church in the South, having been one of the leaders of the Tennessee Synod not only in its contests with other Lutherans, but also in the transformations that took place within that remarkable body which for twenty years was composed of self-educated men, not one of whom had ever been graduated from either a college or a theological seminary. To Dr. Fox more perhaps than to any one else was due the inauguration of Missions, Education and Sunday-schools which stamped the imprint of the Gospel and the spirit of the age upon this ancient body of strict Lutherans. We have read with much interest the lively delineation of his character by his younger son, and especially the sententious introduction by the elder, both of them polished scholars, as also the able memorial discourse by the Rev. A. J. Brown, D. D., and the two sermons by the subject of this sketch which are appended. We sincerely hope that the little volume may have a wide circulation.

R. M. STURGEON & CO., HARRISBURG, PA.

A Complete Handbook of the Monuments and Indications and a Guide to the Positions on the *Gettysburg Battle-field*. By J. Howard Wert, A. M., Principal of the Boys' High School, Harrisburg, Pa., and late Lieutenant Pennsylvania Volunteers. pp. 212. 1886.

There has probably never been published a work more sure to command the national market than this excellent Handbook of the Gettysburg Battle-field by Prof. Wert. With the extraordinary interest which the whole country feels in this memorable contest, and the scores and scores of noble monuments and tablets which now cover these hills of blood, the great and ever-increasing body of visitors will want just such a guide as they wander over the immense area on which the battle raged, and those who cannot come to the sacred spot will even more eagerly desire a work which thoroughly describes the successive stages and different parts of the battle, which outlines very clearly the positions of the contending hosts and which presents in striking illustrations the numerous monuments which have been erected. Prof. Wert wields a strong and graceful pen and having spent a large part of his life in this immediate community he enjoyed peculiar facilities for getting up an accurate and most interesting book.

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON. CHAS. T. DILLINGHAM, NEW YORK.

A Handbook of English History Based on the Lectures of the late M. J. Guest and brought down to the year 1880 with a supplementary

chapter upon English Literature of the Nineteenth Century. By Francis H. Underwood, A. M., author of Handbooks of "English Literature," etc., with Maps, Tables, etc. pp. 614. 1886.

A competent authority has pronounced Guest's "Lectures of English History" as being for their compass the most interesting, impartial, complete and satisfactory ever published. The author had wide knowledge of his subject gained from original sources and he aimed at conducting his readers back to these original fountains there to revel for themselves in the old literature of their country, breathe the same air, think the same thoughts and feel the same feelings as their fathers had done.

A reverent tone pervades the volume and though its candor is conspicuous the cause of Protestantism is delineated in strong colors.

The work of Mr. Underwood has been to adapt the excellent material of Mr. Guest to American students. Having been written by an Englishman for use in an English college, the whole point of view had to be changed. While preserving the author's admirable methods and views the editor has transformed the original book into a volume which in attractive features and solid merits surpasses every compendium of English history known to the writer. For acceptable handbooks the enterprise of Lee and Shepard has not been excelled.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

Modern Unitarianism, Essays and Sermons. By Rev. James Freeman Clarke, D. D., Rev. Joseph Henry Allen, Rev. Samuel R. Calthrop, Rev. Brooke Herford, Rev. John White Chadwick, Rev. Minot J. Savage, Rev. Edward Everett Hale, D. D., Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, Rev. Howard N. Brown, Rev. Andrew P. Peabody, D. D., Rev. Robert Collyer, Rev. Joseph May.

These authors could not make a dull book but they have made a dreary one. With all their grace, beauty, refined sentiment and elevated tone, one wearies of the constant misapprehensions and distortions of the faith and the struggling and futile endeavors to set forth another gospel, or at least to substitute a very small fragment of the Gospel for the whole of it. What a melancholy impression, too, of failure, is made upon the reader, as he contemplates a movement which one hundred years ago started with "a large proportion of the ablest clergy and most influential congregations" of New England, which in the most advanced portion of that latitude "was almost completely identified with the best intelligence, the highest social rank and culture, the morality and humanity, the arts, learning and letters, the political eloquence, the professional and public life of the community" and notwithstanding all this can sum up to-day but three hundred and sixty churches—many of them quite feeble—"and full one-third of these

originally local parishes, founded under the first ecclesiastical polity of the Puritan Colonists."

A Lutheran theologian of Germany remarked of the organization of the Old Catholics that no religious reform could be successful which did not begin with the question, what must I do to be saved? With that began Luther's movement and afterwards Wesley's and they triumphed. But that vital and momentous question has no place either at the foundation or at any other stage of the Unitarian system.

If intelligent, great and noble men could insure the prosperity of a new religious departure, the Unitarians would have swept the country, but in this domain it is not by might nor by power but by the action of the Spirit that success is achieved and the Spirit appropriates to believers the things of Jesus. Those who will not follow in the line of the Spirit, are therefore left to their own darkness and feebleness. And though they talk of knowledge, as does the Rev. May, and "accept of the leadership of Jesus because we feel that in this he had the truth," yet now, as of old, knowledge only puffeth up and here is a volume of learned sermons with hardly a single allusion to faith, forgiveness, prayer or salvation?

As a useful contribution to Church history the little work commends itself, while Dr. Peabody's discourse on the "Simplicity of the Gospel" and Robert Collyer's on "Visions and Patterns" will richly repay every intelligent reader.

D. APPLETON & CO., NEW YORK.

A History of Education by F. V. N. Painter, A. M., Professor of Modern Languages and Literature in Roanoke College. pp. 335. 1886.

Under the title of *International Education Series* and the general editorship of William T. Harris, LL. D., the eminent publishers propose to bring out a series of volumes that will form a much needed library for teachers and school managers and also furnish text-books for Normal Classes. The entire field of practical, theoretical and historical education is to be covered by the series. The conspectus embraces I. History of Education, II. Educational Criticism, III. Treatises on the Theory of Education, IV. The Art of Education.

Fifteen volumes are well under way, European as well as American authors contributing to the series. Dr. Harris is expected to write some of the volumes himself while he will add to each separate one something by way of introduction, analysis and commentary. The first two volumes have appeared, *The Philosophy of Education* by Johann Karl Frederick Rosenkranz, and the bright little volume before us by the youthful Roanoke professor who is not a stranger to the readers of the QUARTERLY.

Of the History of Education, a subject that has been too much neglected in America he has made an entertaining and instructive and use-

VOL. XVI. No. 4.

77 1/2

ful treatise, which will be gratefully hailed by all who are interested in the progress of education. He takes a full and clear though necessarily brief survey of the subject under the following heads: The Oriental Nations, The Ancient Classical Nations, Christian Education before the Reformation, Education from the Reformation to the Present. He has had access to the best authorities in German and French and has made a faithful and discriminating use of them. He is evidently in love with his theme and keeps a happy balance between adherence to past acquisitions and enthusiasm for modern views. Famous educators from Confucius and Socrates to Pestalozzi and Froebel pass under review with judicious criticism and commendation, but the reader will recognize as towering above them all the influence of Martin Luther on education, and must conclude that he was the educational as well as the religious reformer of the sixteenth century. We recommend this work to all who are in any way engaged in the diffusion of education and we congratulate the prosperous Institution "in the Virginia Mountains" on the honor which accrues to it from authorship of this quality. We shall look with avidity for the succeeding volumes of the series and we trust that the success of Prof. Painter's first venture will prompt him to keep his graceful pen in motion.

LUTHERAN CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Eine Union in der Wahrheit. Zum 350 jährigen Gedächtnisse der Wittenberger Concordie vom Jahre 1536. Der Kirche unserer Zeit als ein Spiegel vorgehalten von G. Gösswein, evangelisch-lutherischer Pastor zu Vincennes, Ind. pp. 186. 1886.

This volume answers well as a vade-mecum for those who seek to familiarize themselves with the unionistic efforts of the earlier days of Protestantism.

With great fairness, and in the exact words of the participants, the various points of disagreement are clearly exhibited, enabling the reader to transfer himself in spirit to those times of newly-aroused earnest search after truth, and witness for himself the laudable zeal of those who were struggling to be of one mind and of one heart in holding and proclaiming it.

The famous colloquy at Marburg is graphically described, with its antecedents and consequences; Luther's unfraternal attitude being vindicated as the only one possible where the end aimed at was "*a union in the truth.*"

With this colloquy is approvingly contrasted the *Wittenberg Concord*; and the conduct of Bucer, Capito and their colleagues is held up as a model worthy of imitation by all in our day who are longing for union in the Church. Their frank disavowal of their previous opinions and practices, and their solemn pledge to teach thenceforth in strict accordance with the views held by the Wittenberg theologians, this is

held by the author to be the only scriptural basis for "a union in the truth."

C. A. H.

Biblische Geschichten für Mittelklassen und gemischte Schulen. Mit den Worten der heil. Schrift erzählt. pp. 260. 1886.

Bright and large print on good paper and copious illustrations which strike the eye with sacred scenes, mark this abridged Bible History which is told in the words of the Scriptures and in a style, accordingly, which has never been equaled.

Tanz und Theaterbesuch. Je Zwei Vorträge hierüber, Von C. F. W. Walther. pp. 118. 1886.

This is a pocket edition of the excellent sermons on Theater-going by Prof. Dr. Walther, noticed in a previous number of the QUARTERLY.

R. WOBUS, ST. CHARLES, MO.

Evangelischer Kalender Auf das Jahr unseres Herrn 1887. Herausgegeben von der Evangelischen Synode von Nord-Amerika.

The first of the yearbooks to reach us is from the Evangelical Synod (The Prussian Union) of North America and it excels in the quality of its contents as well as in the promptness of its appearance. Besides the statistical matter of the body, the clerical register, etc., it contains about 100 pages of short, entertaining and wholesome articles, calculated to make it quite a valuable addition to the literature of the fire-side. We know of nothing in this line superior to it in English or German.

SCHAEFFER & KORADI, PHILADELPHIA.

Die Spinnstube, ein Volksbuch fuer das Jahr 1887. Begründet von M. O. von Horn (Wilhelm Oertel). Im Vereine mit namhaften Volksschriftstellern fortgeführt von H. Oertel. Zweiundreizigster Jahrgang. Mit einem Stahlstich und vielen Abbildungen. Wiesbaden.

Among the flood of almanacs with which Germany is deluged near the close of the year, the one here introduced to us seems to have won a wide reputation and made sure for itself a warm welcome in Christian families in this its thirty-second annual issue.

It is a sprightly and entertaining volume of one hundred and sixty-four pages, edited in a genial, evangelical spirit; giving, of course, the usual calendar, with useful hints for work in the house and on the farm, the German weights and measures, postal laws, list of European sovereigns, etc., etc., but furnishing also some pretty stories of a wholesome tendency, interspersed with scraps of poetry, riddles, anecdotes, etc. The artistic character of the profuse illustrations is very creditable.

☞ Notices of the following Books will appear hereafter :

Spinoza and his Environment a critical essay with the translation of the Ethics by Henry Smith, D. D., LL. D. Robert Clarke & Co., Cincinnati.

Systematic Theology a Compendium and Commonplace-book designed for the use of Theological Students by Augustus Hopkins Strong, D. D. E. R. Andrews, Rochester.

Ancient Cities from the Dawn to the Daylight. By William Burnet Wright, Pastor of the Berkley Street Church, Boston. 1886. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

